

MOVING TO WORK (MTW) ANNUAL REPORT



Lexington Housing Authority

Submitted November 21, 2014

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	1
Goals & Objectives	2
II. Operating Information	9
Housing Stock Information	9
Leasing Information	11
Wait List Information	15
III. Proposed MTW Activities	17
IV. Approved MTW Activities	18
Activity #1 – Increase Minimum Rent to \$150 Across All Programs	18
Activity #3 – Triennial Recertification of Connie Griffith Towers and HCV Elderly/Disabled Households.....	29
Activity 10) HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs.....	37
Activity 12) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners.....	44
Activity 13) Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements	55
Previously Approved Not Yet Implemented Activities	71
Activity 5) Streamlined HQS Inspection Policy for HCV Units	71
Activity 7) Public Housing Acquisition Without Prior HUD Approval.....	73
Activity 8) Conversion of Appian Hills Public Housing to Project-Based Vouchers.....	73
Activity 9) Development of Project-Based Voucher Units at 800 Edmond Street.....	75
Activity 11) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds: Emergency Reserves for Connie Griffith-Ballard Towers	75
Closed Out Activities	77
Activity 4) Housing Choice Voucher Rent Reform Controlled Study – No Rent Reduction Requests for 6 Months After Initial Occupancy	77
V. Sources and Uses of Funds.....	81
VI. Administrative.....	82
A. Description of HUD Reviews.....	82
B. KSU Evaluation	83
C. Certification of Statutory Requirements.....	86

Introduction

The mission of the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority (LHA) is to provide safe and desirable affordable housing to low and moderate-income individuals and families while partnering with community agencies to promote increased self-sufficiency and a higher quality of life for its residents. The agency provides housing assistance to nearly 4,000 low-income households in Lexington-Fayette County through the public housing and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) programs.

The LHA is governed by a Board of Commissioners, a group of dedicated citizens and local officials appointed in accordance with state housing law, who establish and monitor agency policies and are responsible for preserving and expanding the Authority's resources and ensuring the Authority's ongoing success.

In November 2010, LHA submitted a formal application to the federal U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) seeking admittance to the Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration program. HUD announced LHA's selection for program admittance in March 2011, and the Authority formally entered the MTW program on November 10, 2011 with the execution of an MTW Agreement between HUD and LHA.

HUD approved the Authority's FY 2012 MTW Annual Plan on December 29, 2011. As LHA entered the MTW Program in the middle of its fiscal year and did not have the opportunity to implement many of its planned activities until late in the Plan year, the Authority received HUD's approval to extend the Plan's effective date through FY 2013 (June 30, 2013). The LHA's FY2014 MTW Annual Plan was approved by HUD on October 7, 2013. The table below is a chronological view of documents submitted for the LHA's participation in the MTW demonstration.

Action Taken	Date Submitted	HUD Approval Granted
LHA applies for MTW	11/20/2010	3/31/2011
MTW Agreement Signed	11/10/2011	N/A
FY 2012-2013 MTW Annual Plan		12/29/2011
Resolutions signed approving 2 nd and 3 rd Amendments to MTW agreement	4/12/2012	N/A
FY2014 MTW Annual Plan	4/16/2013	10/07/2013
FY 2012-2013 Annual Report	9/30/2013	9/26/2014
FY2014 MTW Annual Report	Pending	TBD
FY 2015 MTW Annual Plan	6/12/2014	9/02/2014

Goals and Objectives

The LHA's long-term vision for its participation in the MTW demonstration program integrates this local mission with the federal statutory objectives of the MTW program. The result is a carefully crafted list of local goals, which tailor the federal objectives to the specific needs of the Lexington-Fayette community.

1. Increase the number and quality of affordable housing choices throughout the Lexington-Fayette community.
2. Increase the number of families moving toward self-sufficiency.
3. Increase and strengthen the number of community partnerships benefitting residents with special needs, especially those not adequately served elsewhere in the community and those requiring a "service-enriched" housing environment.
4. Reduce the Agency's administrative costs while limiting the administrative burdens placed on staff and residents.

The following is an update on the progress of the LHA's goals and objectives during FY2014.

Pimlico/Centre Meadows RAD Conversion

On April 28, 2014 the LHA celebrated the completion of financing the \$15 million rehabilitation of the 206-unit Pimlico public housing site. The ceremony allowed LHA staff an opportunity to recognize HUD staff as well as financial, local government partners and consultants who played a part in the financing of the project. The LHA is one of the first PHAs in the country to agree to participate in HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) creating a transaction that involves subsidy conversion, a FHA mortgage, tax-exempt bonds and low income housing tax-credits.



Greg Bryne, Senior Project Manager – Rental Assistance Demonstration, U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development speaking at the Pimlico/RAD Celebration in April 2014.

"We strive to be aggressive and creative in preserving the affordable housing stock we now have as well as increasing the stock whenever opportunities afford themselves," said Austin Simms, executive director. He added, "This \$15 million plus project promises a boost in construction jobs as well as the end result, a shot in the arm for affordable housing in this neighborhood."

Greg Byrne, HUD Senior Project Manager for RAD from the Washington D.C. Office attended and made remarks on the need for this type of program. Bryne said, "...public housing projects across the country has about \$25,000 per unit in backlog needs," "The amount of money that they [PHA's] get is so minimal compared to the backlogged needs," said Bryne. "Rather than try

to fix or reform the public housing program, why don't we allow housing authorities to leave this program and go become like owners and operators of affordable housing like those that have been developed over the past 20 or 30 years, particularly under the Section 8 program," said Bryne. He said RAD allows owners and operators to go out and access private capital, private equity, private debt which PHAs had not previously been allowed to do.



Following the RAD celebration at Pimlico in April LHA staff and board of commissioners paused for a photo with guests. Pictured from left to right, Austin Simms, LHA Executive Director, Joan Whitman, LHA Board of Commissioners, Kenyatta Johnson, LHA Board of Commissioners, Kyna Koch, Chair, LHA Board of Commissioners, Greg Bryne, HUD Senior Project Manager for the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD), Daryl Smith, Vice Chair, LHA Board of Commissioners, Mayor Jim Gray and Robert Kuhnle, HUD Louisville Field Office.

By the end of FY 2014 (June 30, 2014), the LHA was five months into construction at Pimlico Apartments rehabbed through HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD). Pimlico is comprised of eleven buildings and was initially developed in the early 1970's. Located in the southeastern portion of the city of Lexington, the surrounding neighborhood includes primarily single and multi-family residential, schools and commercial uses. This neighborhood has consistently exhibited high occupancy rates for multi-family residential properties as a result of the location which benefits from nearby commercial amenities and transportation routes.

Planned renovations for Pimlico include improvements to both the interior and exteriors of all apartments and buildings, as well as required site work. This mixed-finance redevelopment project is being paid for by LHA funds, 4% Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), Kentucky Housing Corporation (KHC) HOME Funds, and FHA mortgage funds. As of June 30, 2014 renovation completion was 21%. The anticipated completion date of March 2016 will be a new beginning for the site because through RAD the site will be subsidized by Project-Based Housing Choice Voucher (PBV) rather than public housing subsidy. In addition, when the site reopens it will operate under the name of Centre Meadows.

Resident/Stakeholder Meetings

The LHA remains committed to the goal of improving communications with residents and stakeholders. Staff takes seriously the role of keeping our residents and stakeholders informed of changes that affect them. Housing managers and the HCV manager are directed to hold resident meetings at least quarterly as well as attend and bring resident representatives to quarterly stakeholders meetings. Residents are encouraged to attend and participate to advise LHA staff on the most effective ways to reach their neighbors, while serving as a conduit to disseminate information to the rest of the community. The meetings also provide real-time feedback on MTW initiatives, allowing the Authority to course-correct as soon as issues arise. Information is dispersed to residents through the use of the agency's website, special events and resident newsletters.

Additional Resident Services Coordinator Hired

At the request of the LHA Board the Housing Authority has hired a Resident Services Coordinator that is located at the LHA's Ballard-Griffith Towers, two elderly high-rise buildings, to address the needs of elderly and disabled tenants. Earlier in FY2014 LHA staff and its board were asked on by Ballard-Griffith residents and members of the neighborhood representatives to address concerns of illegal activity and unauthorized visitors to the facilities. In an effort to reinforce the safety and well-being of Ballard-Griffith Towers the LHA hired a resident service coordinator to complement the ROSS-funded coordinator that was hired in January 2013 primarily dedicated to the Ballard building. The position is required to coordinate referrals for assistance to residents in job placement, health care, substance abuse recovery, legal referral, transportation, and aging-in-place home management.

5-Star Inspection Program Update

Staff is excited to see progress in the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) 5-Star Inspection Program for landlords. When the activity was proposed in the FY2012-FY2013 Plan and significantly modified in the FY2014 Plan, progress stalled due to issues with electronically rating current landlords, with the software LHA was using at the time, based on inspection scores, drive-by inspections, participant complaints and abatements. As reported earlier in this report, the LHA converted to Emphasys Elite software in June 2014 and since that date it is possible for staff to rate and track landlord ratings.

During FY2014, Section 220 of the 2014 Appropriations Act allowed housing authorities beginning July 1, 2014 to inspect assisted housing units in the HCV program biennially, rather than annually. At the time this activity was introduced HUD regulations required annual inspections of every HCV unit to ensure they met Housing Quality Standards (HQS). After the HUD notice of biennial inspections LHA staff had to make changes to the star rated inspection schedules based. Even with the change staff sees this activity as viable and important to identifying landlords with the most at-risk/problematic properties to inspect them more frequently to address HQS issues. LHA continues to uphold HUD's high standards of decent, safe, and sanitary housing maintained in good repair for all HCV households, the Authority believes it can achieve this outcome more cost-effectively through the *Star Rating System* for HCV property owners.

Tenant Database Software Conversion

In January 2014 following a thorough analysis of LHA's ongoing software needs the LHA Board of Commissioners approved LHA staff to enter into a contract with Emphasys Software for the public housing and HCV tenant database system. On June 1, 2014 the LHA converted tenant database files for both public housing and the HCV programs to Emphasys Elite. The new software program will streamline processes and increase productivity. Although the conversion was complete on June 1 staff continues to work with Emphasys programmers to resolve issues of incomplete and/or missing data.

STRIVE – Resident Rewards Incentive Program

One of the most promising and exciting initiatives included in LHA's goals for the Moving To Work (MTW) program is the Self-Sufficiency Through Resident Involvement Vision & Education (STRIVE) Program to reward positive behavior among LHA households. STRIVE was debuted to LHA residents living at one of the LHA's newest HOPE VI sites during the summer of 2014. STRIVE was introduced to households with children enrolled and attending the 2014 session of summer school at William Wells Brown Elementary (grades K-fifth). The parents/guardians of eleven (11) children enrolled in summer school gave their permission for the children to participate in the LHA's first STRIVE initiative. The children earned points for improved reading and math skills, good conduct and attendance that could later be redeemed time for gift cards and toys. LHA staff sees this inaugural venture of STRIVE as a good start and a way to demonstrate the initiative to possible donors.

Equestrian View Homeownership

All but five of 101 single-family homes have sold in the Equestrian View subdivision. The subdivision is the final phase of development in the Housing Authority's HOPE VI redevelopment in the former Bluegrass-Aspendale neighborhood. The average cost of a home in Equestrian View is approximately \$110,000-\$120,000. Equestrian View homebuyers are offered the incentives of:

- *Down Payment Assistance of \$14,999 - \$30,000 for qualified households*
- *LHA Purchase Incentive Funds of up to \$3,000 per household to be used for appliances (refrigerator, washer, dryer, etc.), fencing, landscaping, closing costs or down payment assistance*
- *Builder Discounts Up to \$5,000*
- *Bank Loan Program Incentives*



Public Housing and HCV Wait Lists Partially Closed Throughout 2014

On May 1, 2013 the LHA's public housing waiting list (excluding Connie Griffith Tower, which is designated near-elderly) was closed. The waiting list remained closed for the duration of FY 2014. As of July 1, 2013, the Housing Authority's HCV waiting list was closed. The LHA planned to keep its voucher waiting list closed until Pimlico relocation was complete. HCV staff reports that the wait list is completely exhausted and will likely reopen for general tenant-based applicants during FY2015.

HCV Rent Reform Study



Members of the HCV Rent Reform research team visited the LHA in September 2014. Pictured left to right: Nandita Verma, MDRC, Cindy Mayfield, HCV Specialist, Tracy Holmes, HCV Specialist, Riki Whitlock, HCV FSS Coordinator, Lee Cameron, HCV Specialist and Jessica Porter, The Bronner Group.

LHA staff committed to participate in HUD’s HCV Rent Reform Study scheduled to begin in December 2014 enrollment. During the second half of FY2014 LHA staff worked with HUD, the other participating housing authorities and the research team led by MDRC research firm to discuss needs of the study and to identify and address concerns of the participating agencies. The study proposes an alternative rent policy to be tested in the demonstration and a strategy for a comprehensive evaluation of that policy. The evaluation will include a randomized control trial to test the effects of the alternative rent policy on labor market and other outcomes for Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) recipients. The study will focus on approximately 1,400 (700 in the control group and 700 in the treatment group) working-age/non-disabled voucher holders. Elderly and disabled households are not being included in the study.

Four housing agencies have committed to participate in the demonstration: Lexington, Louisville, San Antonio, and Washington, DC. As part of the research design phase of the demonstration, the MDRC team worked closely with HUD and the candidate housing agencies to develop an alternative rent model. It was vital to try to design a policy *in close partnership with housing agencies* that were candidates for the demonstration, given the real-world expertise they would bring to the process, and also because it was unlikely any housing agency would implement an alternative rent policy and join an evaluation if it had no say in the policy design and no sense of ownership over the policy – which would also be contrary to the notion behind MTW.¹

¹Rent Reform Demonstration Research Design Paper Submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Revised Draft: February 20, 2014

The proposed alternative rent policy, which will focus only on HCV recipients, includes the following key features:

- A change in the percent of income that voucher holders pay for their share, from 30 percent of **adjusted income** to a maximum of 28 percent of **gross income** (thus eliminating deductions and allowances),
- A minimum total tenant payment (TTP) and/or minimum tenant rent paid directly to the landlord, ranging from \$50 to \$150 per month (to ensure that most tenants contribute something to their shelter costs),
- Ignoring a household's asset income when total asset value is below \$25,000 (to simplify TTP calculations and provide an incentive for asset accumulation),
- A triennial rather than annual income recertification period (thus creating a rent freeze intended to function as a powerful work incentive),
- A simplified policy for utilities (to reduce calculation costs and errors), and
- Hardship policies to protect tenants with exceptional circumstances from harm.

The multiple goals of an alternative rent policy are to: (a) simplify the administration of the HCV rent system to improve transparency, reduce burden on housing agency staff and tenants, and reduce administrative costs; (b) increase the financial incentives for tenants to work and advance toward self-sufficiency; and (c) not cause sizable increases in housing agencies' HAP expenditures. The demonstration's randomized trials will test whether, and the extent to which, the alternative model achieves these goals. Pending completion of software upgrades, the research team anticipates that the enrollment process will begin in November or December 2014.

FY2014 MTW Activities Summary Table

Activity #	Title	Approval Year/Implementation	Status
1	Increase Minimum Rent to \$150 Across All Housing Programs	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013 for Pimlico; Implemented May 1, 2012; Activity Expanded FY2014; Implemented April 1, 2014	Ongoing
3	Triennial Recertification of Connie Griffith Towers and HCV Elderly/Disabled Households	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013 for Connie Griffith; Implemented January 1, 2012; Activity Expanded FY2014 to HCV Units Elderly/Disabled; Implemented April 1, 2014	Ongoing
10	HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs	FY2012 – FY2013; Implemented January 2013	Ongoing
12	Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners	Proposed FY 2014; Implemented January 2014	Ongoing
13	Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements	Proposed FY 2014; Implemented April 1, 2014	Ongoing
5	Streamlined HQS Inspection Policy for Housing Choice Voucher Units	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013; revised in FY2014	Not Yet Implemented
7	Public Housing Acquisition Without Prior HUD Approval	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013	Not Yet Implemented
8	Conversion of Appian Hills Public Housing to Project-Based Vouchers	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013; revised in FY2014	Not Yet Implemented
9	Development of Project-Based Voucher Units at 800 Edmond Street	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013	Not Yet Implemented
11	Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds: Emergency Reserves for Connie Griffith-Ballard Towers	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013; revised in FY2014	Not Yet Implemented
4	Housing Choice Voucher Rent Reform Controlled Study – No Rent Reduction Requests for 6 Months After Initial Occupancy	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013; implemented during 2013	Closed Out

II. Operating Information

Annual MTW Report				
II.4.Report.HousingStock				
A. MTW Report: Housing Stock Information				
New Housing Choice Vouchers that were Project-Based During the Fiscal Year				
Property Name	Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Actual Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Description of Project	
Pimlico (post-renovation name - Centre Meadows)	206	0	During FY 2014, all 206 units at the Pimlico public housing development were converted to project-based vouchers through the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD), and included in the agency's MTW program. Although renovations of the Pimlico site began during FY2014, the LHA does not expect to begin leasing the newly renovated units at the site – which will be renamed "Centre Meadows" - until FY2015.	
N/A	0	0	N/A	
N/A	0	0	N/A	
N/A	0	0	N/A	
Anticipated Total Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *		Actual Total Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year *	Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year *
206		0	206	0
Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year		Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year		
0		0		
* From the Plan				

Other Changes to the Housing Stock that Occurred During the Fiscal Year		
206 units were placed in HUD Vacant Approved status due to the relocation of residents at Pimilico site currently under renovation through the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD).		
N/A		
N/A		
Examples of the types of other changes can include but are not limited to units that are held off-line due to the relocation of residents, units that are off-line due to substantial rehabilitation and potential plans for acquiring units.		
General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year		
KY004 - PHA-Wide Software upgrade \$193,256 KY004000001-Bainbridge-PineVly-Const: Roof Replacements; Parking Lot Pavement Repair \$26,260 KY004000003-Unnamed: Roof Replacement; Sidewalk Repair/replacement \$137,037 KY004000004-Connie Griffith: Flooring & door hardware upgrade/replacement; Cooling Tower Replacement; Camera Security upgrades; Exterior Water Repellent Repair; Security Services \$470,555 KY004000011-Bluegrass Phase II: Security Services \$26,198 KY004000012-Pimlico A & E Fees \$283,815 KY004000011-Bluegrass Phase II: Security Services \$6680 KY004000013-Bluegrass Phase III: Security Services \$16,701 KY004000015-Bridlewood Apartments: Security Services \$24,495 KY004000033-Grand Oaks Apartments: Security Services \$24,495		
Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by the PHA at Fiscal Year End		
Housing Program *	Total Units	Overview of the Program
Non-MTW HUD Funded	321	These vouchers are committed to Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) (246), Shelter Plus Care (50) and Mainstream (25)
Tax Credit	196	Ballard - Elderly high rise (134 units); Sugar Mill - 15 market rate rental units; LHOCII - 13 single-family units; Faith Community Housing (FCH) 34 market-rate single-family rental units
Market Rate	5	Jefferson Street - 1 single family and 4 apartments market rate rental units
Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed	522	
* Select Housing Program from: Tax-Credit, State Funded, Locally Funded, Market-Rate, Non-MTW HUD Funded, Managing Developments for other non-MTW Public Housing Authorities, or Other.		
If Other, please describe:		N/A

II.5.Report.Leasing		
B. MTW Report: Leasing Information		
Actual Number of Households Served at the End of the Fiscal Year		
Housing Program:	Number of Households Served*	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs **	0	0
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	358	358
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	175	175
Total Projected and Actual Households Served	533	533
<p>* Calculated by dividing the planned/actual number of unit months occupied/leased by 12.</p> <p>** In instances when a Local, Non-Traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of Households served.</p>		
Housing Program:	Unit Months Occupied/Leased****	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs ***	0	0
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs ***	4296	4296
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	2100	2100
Total Projected and Annual Unit Months Occupied/Leased	6396	6396
<p>N/A - Explanation for differences between planned and actual households served</p>		
<p>*** In instances when a local, non-traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of households served.</p> <p>**** Unit Months Occupied/Leased is the total number of months the housing PHA has occupied/leased units, according to unit category during the year.</p>		
	Average Number of Households Served Per Month	Total Number of Households Served During the Year
Households Served through Local Non-Traditional Services Only	358	4296

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: 75% of Families Assisted are Very Low-Income								
<p>HUD will verify compliance with the statutory objective of “assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families” is being achieved by examining public housing and Housing Choice Voucher family characteristics as submitted into the PIC or its successor system utilizing current resident data at the end of the agency's fiscal year. The PHA will provide information on local, non-traditional families provided with housing assistance at the end of the PHA fiscal year, not reported in PIC or its successor system, in the following format:</p>								
Fiscal Year:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	X	X	X	358	X	X	X	X
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	X	X	X	358	X	X	X	X
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	X	X	X	100%	X	X	X	X

Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: Maintain Comparable Mix					
<p>In order to demonstrate that the statutory objective of “maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size) are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration” is being achieved, the PHA will provide information in the following formats:</p>					
Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served					
Family Size:	Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes *	Baseline Number of Household Sizes to be Maintained	Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained
1 Person	421	818	0	1239	34%
2 Person	310	529	0	839	23%
3 Person	298	505	0	803	22%
4 Person	135	313	0	448	12%
5 Person	49	168	0	217	6%
6+ Person	24	72	0	96	3%
Totals	1237	2405	0	3642	100%
Explanation for Baseline Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes Utilized	N/A				

Mix of Family Sizes Served							
	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained **	34%	23%	22%	12%	6%	3%	100%
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year ***	958	669	734	474	229	119	3183
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year ****	30%	21%	23%	15%	7%	4%	100%
Percentage Change	-12%	-9%	5%	25%	#DIV/0!		
Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages	The variances over 5% of baseline percentages can be attributed in part to 206 units that were placed in HUD Vacant Approved status due to the relocation of residents at Pimilico site currently under renovation through the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) during FY2014. In addition, both the public housing and HCV wait list remained partially open during FY2014. For public housing, only elderly households could apply for Connie Griffith high-rise building during FY2014. For the HCV program, only special partner programs could apply during FY2014. Both programs have exhausted their wait lists and will open them during FY2015.						
* “Non-MTW adjustments to the distribution of family sizes” are defined as factors that are outside the control of the PHA. Acceptable “non-MTW adjustments” include, but are not limited to, demographic changes in the community’s population. If the PHA includes non-MTW adjustments, HUD expects the explanations of the factors to be thorough and to include information substantiating the numbers used.							
** The numbers in this row will be the same numbers in the chart above listed under the column “Baseline percentages of family sizes to be maintained.”							
*** The methodology used to obtain these figures will be the same methodology used to determine the “Occupied number of Public Housing units by family size when PHA entered MTW” and “Utilized number of Section 8 Vouchers by family size when PHA entered MTW” in the table immediately above.							
**** The “Percentages of families served by family size this fiscal year” will reflect adjustments to the mix of families served that are directly due to decisions the PHA has made. HUD expects that in the course of the demonstration, PHAs will make decisions that may alter the number of families served.							

Description of any Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Solutions at Fiscal Year End		
Housing Program	Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions	
Public Housing	During FY2014 public housing self-sufficiency sites experienced a like of applicants to draw from due to the wait list being closed for all of FY2014. The agency plans to partially open the wait list for two and three bedroom self-sufficiency sites during FY2015.	
Housing Choice Voucher	The LHA has traditionally maintained high occupancy rates in both its HCV program. The HCV wait list was closed during FY2014. LHA issued tenant-based HCVs to facilitate the relocation of Pimlico residents prior to RAD conversion. By the end of FY2014, the HCV program had exhausted its wait list the wait list will be opened for a short period during FY2015.	
N/A	N/A	

Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End		
Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned *	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
Increase Minimum Rent to \$150 Across All Housing Programs/Activity #1	406	Any household with earned-income of at least \$15,080 per year and has paid their rent on time for the past 12 months.
HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs/Activity #10	0	Any household with earned-income of at least \$15,080 per year
Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners/Activity #12	0	Any household with earned-income of at least \$15,080 per year
Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions	0	* The number provided here should match the outcome reported where metric SS #8 is used.
ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY	406	

II.6.Report.Leasing				
C. MTW Report: Wait List Information				
Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End				
Housing Program(s) *	Wait List Type **	Number of Households on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed ***	Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year
Public Housing	Site-Based	2378	Partially Open	No
Housing Choice Voucher	Community-Wide	33	Closed	No
Non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher	Program Specific	12	Open	Yes
Tenant-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program	N/A	0	Open	Yes

More can be added if needed.

* *Select Housing Program* : Federal MTW Public Housing Units; Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program; Federal non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Units; Tenant-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; and Combined Tenant-Based and Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program.

** *Select Wait List Types*: Community-Wide, Site-Based, Merged (Combined Public Housing or Voucher Wait List), Program Specific (Limited by HUD or Local PHA Rules to Certain Categories of Households which are Described in the Rules for Program Participation), None (If the Program is a New Wait List, Not an Existing Wait List), or Other (Please Provide a Brief Description of this Wait List Type).

*** For Partially Open Wait Lists, provide a description of the populations for which the waiting list is open.

Public Housing Program - The LHA's public housing wait list was partially open only for the elderly interested in living at Connie Griffith Towers (elderly only building).
Non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program - The wait list remained open for Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH), Shelter Plus Care and Mainstream programs during FY2014. These programs enable families including: homeless people with disabilities, primarily those with serious mental illness, chronic problems with alcohol and/or drugs, and AIDS or related diseases; and, homeless veterans with case management and clinical services to lease affordable private housing of their choice.
Housing Program and Description of the populations for which the wait list is open

If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe:

Tenant-Based, Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program Wait List - The LHA has ten special partner programs that independently manage their own wait lists. LHA maintains a Memoranda of Understanding with these social service agencies in the Lexington area to provide stable housing to low-income families while they participate in programming provided by the partner agency. Participants are issued tenant-based vouchers, but they are required to reside in designated housing provided by the partner agency as long as they remain enrolled in social service programming. Programs that serve victims of domestic violence; individuals with mental illness and/or substance abuse issues; individuals recently released from prison or jail; families in need of financial literacy, credit management, and homeownership resources; single parents enrolled full-time in higher education; and homeless individuals and families.
--

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

N/A
N/A
N/A

If there are any changes to the organizational structure of the wait list or policy changes regarding the wait list, provide a narrative detailing these changes.

N/A

FY2014 MTW Activities Summary Table

Activity #	Title	Approval Year/Implementation	Status
1	Increase Minimum Rent to \$150 Across All Housing Programs	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013 for Pimlico; Implemented May 1, 2012; Activity Expanded FY2014; Implemented April 1, 2014	Ongoing
3	Triennial Recertification of Connie Griffith Towers and HCV Elderly/Disabled Households	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013 for Connie Griffith; Implemented January 1, 2012; Activity Expanded FY2014 to HCV Units Elderly/Disabled; Implemented April 1, 2014	Ongoing
10	HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs	FY2012 – FY2013; Implemented January 2013	Ongoing
12	Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners	Proposed FY 2014; Implemented January 2014	Ongoing
13	Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements	Proposed FY 2014; Implemented April 1, 2014	Ongoing
5	Streamlined HQS Inspection Policy for Housing Choice Voucher Units	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013; revised in FY2014	Not Yet Implemented
7	Public Housing Acquisition Without Prior HUD Approval	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013	Not Yet Implemented
8	Conversion of Appian Hills Public Housing to Project-Based Vouchers	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013; revised in FY2014	Not Yet Implemented
9	Development of Project-Based Voucher Units at 800 Edmond Street	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013	Not Yet Implemented
11	Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds: Emergency Reserves for Connie Griffith-Ballard Towers	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013; revised in FY2014	Not Yet Implemented
4	Housing Choice Voucher Rent Reform Controlled Study – No Rent Reduction Requests for 6 Months After Initial Occupancy	Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013; implemented during 2013	Closed Out

III. Proposed MTW Activities

All proposed activities that are granted approval by HUD are reported on in Section IV as 'Approved Activities'.

IV. Approved MTW Activities

Activity #1 - Increase Minimum Rent to \$150 Across All Housing Programs

1. Plan year in which the activity was first approved and implemented;

Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013 for Pimlico Apartments

Implemented May 1, 2012

Activity Expanded FY2014 to all Public Housing Units and HCV Units

Implemented April 1, 2014

2. Activity Description

The LHA increased the minimum rent to \$150 across all housing programs (Section 8 & 9) excluding elderly and/or disabled households and households participating in HCV special partner programs during FY 2014. For public housing tenants the increase took effect on April 1, 2014 raising the minimum rent from \$50 to \$150; the increase for HCV participants took effect beginning with April 1, 2014 annual recertifications.

Based on metrics collected for this activity the average annual earned income (gross) of \$13,263 for public housing residents paying at least \$150 in monthly rent increased by 26% in FY2014 compared to the baseline of \$10,512, while HCV households actual average earned income (gross) decreased by less than 1% compared to the baseline. It is important to note that the HCV household minimum rent increase takes effect at the participant's annual recert; therefore changes will be more gradual for those households. LHA staff concludes that the average earned income decrease is in part due to the closing of Pimlico (206 units) at the start of FY2014; attributing to the increase in public housing household's earned income because the majority of the households at that site had no earned income and by taking Pimlico out of the numbers subsequently increases earned income averages. In turn, the majority of those Pimlico households moved over from public housing to the HCV Program, still reporting no income, caused the average annual earned income among HCV households to go down.

The initiative promotes self-sufficiency by encouraging heads-of-household to work, while raising much-needed revenue. The increased actual monthly rent revenue of \$757,839 a 19% increase during FY2014 compared to the baseline, can then be put directly back into the LHA's public housing developments to include, but not limited to – allowing LHA to complete long-deferred maintenance projects, in addition to using this revenue to supplement the voucher program funding and assist more families.

i. Hardship Requests

Two (2) hardship requests were received since the activity was implemented on April 1, 2014; both requests were denied.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

Benchmarks for the HUD Standard metrics were not achieved for this activity because Standard HUD metrics were not required in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan.

4. Revised benchmarks or metrics, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact;

See pages 20-28.

5. If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected.

LHA staff tracked tenant rents of the non-disabled / non-elderly public housing and HCV households that paid less than \$150 in rent.

In this report the LHA has reported on the metrics created by the LHA and presented in the LHA's FY2014 MTW Annual Plan. It is important to note that MTW agencies are now required to use HUD standard metrics, but at the time of submission of the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan, the LHA was not required to use HUD standard metrics, therefore benchmarks are not reported in the HUD standard metrics tables.

In addition, the LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014, making historical data from before this time difficult to retrieve. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

Activity #1 – Increase Minimum Rent to \$150 Across All Housing Programs**LHA Metrics****Agency-Wide Metrics**

Households Subject to Rent Reform Activity

HCV
866*Public Housing*
641**Impact: Encouraging non-disabled/non-elderly (ND/NE) adult household members to work**

Metric	Program	FY 2013 Baseline	FY 2014 Benchmark	FY 2014 Actual*	Data Source
# (%) of families paying at least \$150 per month in gross rent / TTP	Public Housing	641 (75%)	860 (100%)	700 (99%)	Win Ten2
	HCV	866 (60%)	1,454 (100%)	1,312 (92%)	
	Agency-Wide	1,507 (65%)	2,314 (100%)	2,012 (94%)	
Avg (Median) gross annual earned income reported by families	Public Housing	\$10,512,(\$8,190)	\$10,825 (\$8,425)	\$13,263 (\$12,480)	Win Ten2
	HCV	\$8,632 (\$3,000)	\$8,890 (\$3,075)	\$8,626 (\$3,510)	
	Agency-Wide	\$9,331 (\$6,084)	\$9,605 (\$6,225)	\$10,156 (\$7,540)	
Avg (Median) total adjusted annual income reported by families	Public Housing	\$11,197 (\$8958)	\$11,530 (\$9,220)	\$14,478 (\$12,184)	Win Ten2
	HCV	\$10,501 (\$8,136)	\$10,815 (\$8,375)	\$10,325 (\$7,736)	
	Agency-Wide	\$10,760 (\$8,410)	\$11,075 (\$8,650)	\$11,695 (\$9,540)	
Avg (Median) monthly gross rent payment / TTP of families	Public Housing	\$281 (\$226)	\$302 (\$226)	\$352 (\$304)	Win Ten2
	HCV	\$271 (\$203)	\$306 (\$203)	\$357 (\$269)	
	Agency-Wide	\$275 (\$211)	\$305 (\$211)	\$355 (\$278)	
# (%) of families requesting hardship exemptions (of those whose rent is increased)	Public Housing	N/A	11 (5%)	2	Win Ten2
	HCV	N/A	29 (5%)	0	
	Agency-Wide	N/A	40 (5%)	2	
# (%) of families granted hardship exemptions (of those whose rent is increased)	Public Housing	N/A	7 (3%)	0	Staff
	HCV	N/A	18 (3%)	0	
	Agency-Wide	N/A	25 (3%)	0	
# (%) of residents who leave LHA housing	Public Housing	97 (11%)	102 (12%)	245 (17%)	Win Ten2
	HCV	152 (10%)	160 (11%)	202 (14%)	
	Agency-Wide	257 (11%)	270 (12%)	347 (15%)	

*The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014, making historical data from before this time difficult to retrieve. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

Impact: Assessing the costs/benefits of this activity for LHA

Metric	Program	FY 2013 Baseline	FY 2014 Benchmark	FY 2014 Actual*	Data Source
Total gross monthly rent revenue (Net monthly rent revenue)	Public Housing	\$242,040 (\$146,196)	\$259,737 (\$163,893)	\$247,812 (\$174,868)	Win Ten2
	HCV	\$394,734 (\$145,633)	\$445,333 (\$196,232)	\$510,027 (\$283,346)	
	Agency-Wide	\$636,774 (\$291,829)	\$705,070 (\$360,125)	\$757,839 (\$458,214)	
# of initiative-related complaints reported to staff	Public Housing	N/A	20	5	Property Manager Log
	HCV	N/A	55	6	
	Agency-Wide	N/A	75	11	
Staff time spent handling initiative–related complaints	Public Housing	N/A	7 hours	1.25 hours	Property Manager Log
	HCV	N/A	18 hours	1.5 hours	
	Agency-Wide	N/A	25 hours	2.75 hours	
*The LHA’s fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014, making historical data from before this time difficult to retrieve. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.					

CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark*	Outcome**	Benchmark Achieved?*
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	Public Housing: \$2,576,196 (\$1,612,512)	Public Housing: N/A	Public Housing: \$2,973,744 (\$2,098,416)	Public Housing: TBD
	Sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from 759 non-disabled/non-elderly households as of June 30, 2013	Expected sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from non-disabled/non-elderly households as of June 30, 2014	Actual sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from 704 non-disabled/non-elderly households as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report
	HCV Program: \$6,423,672 (\$3,457,392)	HCV Program: N/A	HCV Program: \$6,120,324 (\$3,400,152)	HCV Program: TBD
	Sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from 1,540 non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households as of June 30, 2013	Expected sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households as of June 30, 2014	Actual sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from 1,430 non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report
	Agency-Wide: \$8,999,868 (\$5,069,904)	Agency-Wide: N/A	Agency-Wide: \$9,094,068 (\$5,498,568)	Agency-Wide: TBD
	Sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from 2,299 non-public housing & HCV households as of June 30, 2013	Expected sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from public housing & HCV households as of June 30, 2014	Actual sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from 2,134 public housing & HCV households as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report

Data Sources: Win Ten2, Tenmast

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

**The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014, making historical data from before this time difficult to retrieve. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

<i>SS #1: Increase in Household Income</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark*	Outcome**	Benchmark Achieved?*
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<i>Public Housing: \$11,487</i>	<i>Public Housing: N/A</i>	<i>Public Housing: \$13,263</i>	<i>Public Housing: TBD</i>
	Average gross annual earned income from 759 non-disabled/non-elderly households as of June 30, 2013	Expected average gross annual earned income from non-disabled/non-elderly households as of June 30, 2014	Actual average gross annual earned income from 704 non-disabled/non-elderly households as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report
	<i>HCV Program: \$8,316</i>	<i>HCV Program: N/A</i>	<i>HCV Program: \$8,626</i>	<i>HCV Program: TBD</i>
	Average gross annual earned income from 1,540 non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households as of June 30, 2013	Expected average gross annual earned income from non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households as of June 30, 2014	Actual average gross annual earned income from 1,430 non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report
	<i>Agency-Wide: \$9,363</i>	<i>Agency-Wide: N/A</i>	<i>Agency-Wide: \$10,156</i>	<i>Agency-Wide: TBD</i>
	Average gross annual earned income from 2,299 public housing & HCV households as of June 30, 2013	Expected average gross annual earned income from public housing & HCV households as of June 30, 2014	Actual average gross annual earned income from 2,134 public housing & HCV households as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report

Data Sources: Win Ten2, Tenmast

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

**The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014, making historical data from before this time difficult to retrieve. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
<i>Report the Baseline, Benchmark and Outcome data for each type of employment status for those head(s) of households affected by the self-sufficiency activity.</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark*	Outcome**	Benchmark Achieved?*
Report the following information separately for each category: (5) Unemployed and (6) Other, where Other is defined as heads of households that report earned income	Category 5: Unemployed Heads of Household			
	Public Housing: 255 (34%)	Public Housing: N/A	Public Housing: 193 (27%)	Public Housing: TBD
	Non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2013	Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2014	Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head has no earned income as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report
	HCV Program: 734 (48%)	HCV Program: N/A	HCV Program: 652 (46%)	HCV Program: TBD
	Non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2013	Expected non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2014	Actual non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head has no earned income as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report
	Agency-Wide: 989 (43%)	Agency-Wide: N/A	Agency-Wide: 845 (40%)	Agency-Wide: TBD
	Public housing & HCV households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2013	Expected public housing & HCV households where head/co-head has no earned income as of June 30, 2014	Actual public housing & HCV households where head/co-head has no earned income as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report
	Category 6: Other (Heads of Household Reporting Earned Income)			
	Public Housing: 504 (66%)	Public Housing: N/A	Public Housing: 511 (73%)	Public Housing: TBD
	Non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head has earned income as of June 30, 2013	Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head has earned income as of June 30, 2014	Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households where head/co-head has earned income as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report
	HCV Program: 806 (52%)	HCV Program: N/A	HCV Program: 778 (54%)	HCV Program: TBD
	Non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head has earned income as of June 30, 2013	Expected non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head has earned income as of June 30, 2014	Actual non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households where head/co-head has earned income as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report
	Agency-Wide: 1,310 (57%)	Agency-Wide: N/A	Agency-Wide: 1,289 (60%)	Agency-Wide: TBD
	Public housing & HCV households where head/co-head has earned income as of June 30, 2013	Expected public housing & HCV households where head/co-head has earned income as of June 30, 2014	Actual public housing & HCV households where head/co-head has earned income as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report

Data Sources: Win Ten2, Tenmast

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

**The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014, making historical data from before this time difficult to retrieve. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

<i>SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark*	Outcome**	Benchmark Achieved?*
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	<i>Public Housing: 42</i>	<i>Public Housing: N/A</i>	<i>Public Housing: 31</i>	<i>Public Housing: TBD</i>
	Non-disabled/non-elderly households receiving TANF as of June 30, 2013	Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households receiving TANF as of June 30, 2014	Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households receiving TANF as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report
	<i>HCV Program: 86</i>	<i>HCV Program: N/A</i>	<i>HCV Program: 86</i>	<i>HCV Program: TBD</i>
	Non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households receiving TANF as of June 30, 2013	Expected non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households receiving TANF as of June 30, 2014	Actual non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households receiving TANF as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report
	<i>Agency-Wide: 128</i>	<i>Agency-Wide: N/A</i>	<i>Agency-Wide: 117</i>	<i>Agency-Wide: TBD</i>
	Public housing & HCV households receiving TANF as of June 30, 2013	Expected public housing & HCV households receiving TANF as of June 30, 2014	Actual public housing & HCV households receiving TANF as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Report

Data Sources: Win Ten2, Tenmast

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

**The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014, making historical data from before this time difficult to retrieve. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

<i>SS #8: Households transitioned to self-sufficiency. For this activity, self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least \$15,080¹ per year and has paid their rent on-time for the past 12 months.</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark*	Outcome**	Benchmark Achieved?*
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	<i>Public Housing: 50</i>	<i>Public Housing: N/A</i>	<i>Public Housing: 37</i>	<i>Public Housing: TBD</i>
	Non-disabled/non-elderly households meeting definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2013	Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households transitioned to self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2014	Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households transitioned to self-sufficiency as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report
	<i>HCV Program: 399</i>	<i>HCV Program: N/A</i>	<i>HCV Program: 369</i>	<i>HCV Program: TBD</i>
	Non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households meeting definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2013	Expected non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner households transitioned to self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2014	Actual non-disabled/non-elderly/non-special partner transitioned to self-sufficiency as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report
	<i>Agency-Wide: 449</i>	<i>Agency-Wide: N/A</i>	<i>Agency-Wide: 406</i>	<i>Agency-Wide: TBD</i>
	Public housing & HCV households meeting definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2013	Expected public housing & HCV households transitioned to self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2014	Actual public housing & HCV households transitioned to self-sufficiency as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report

Data Sources: Win Ten2, Tenmast

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

**The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014, making historical data from before this time difficult to retrieve. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

¹ \$15,080 = Federal minimum wage (\$7.25/hour) x 40-hour work week x 52 weeks of work per year

Activity #1 – Disparate Impact Analysis

Public Housing Population	Heads of Household		Average Gross Annual Eaned Income		Average Total Annual Adjusted Income		Average Gross Rent Payment		Average Increased Rent Burden	
	FY 2013	FY 2014*	FY 2013	FY 2014*	FY 2013	FY 2014*	FY 2013	FY 2014*	FY 2014 Benchmark	FY 2014 Actual*
All Households	860	704	\$10,512	\$13,263	\$11,197	\$14,478	\$281	\$352	\$21	\$71
Gender										
Female	774	636	\$10,610	\$13,392	\$11,245	\$14,588	\$284	\$354	\$20	\$70
Male	86	68	\$9,623	\$12,049	\$10,764	\$13,447	\$260	\$335	\$26	\$75
Race (Multiple selections permitted)										
Black	677	577	\$10,959	\$13,635	\$11,656	\$14,789	\$290	\$358	\$21	\$68
White	179	126	\$9,267	\$11,668	\$10,022	\$13,199	\$257	\$324	\$17	\$67
American Indian / Native Alaskan	4	3	\$9,407	\$15,847	\$3,333	\$10,271	\$116	\$262	\$34	\$146
Asian / Pacific Islander	5	5	\$13,170	\$12,172	\$7,930	\$10,810	\$208	\$284	\$27	\$76
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	4	4	\$8,120	\$10,683	\$6,890	\$12,044	\$210	\$305	\$4	\$95
Other**	3	-	\$0	-	\$568	-	\$83	-	\$67	-
Ethnicity										
Non-Hispanic	843	688	\$10,514	\$13,254	\$11,245	\$14,510	\$282	\$352	\$35	\$70
Hispanic	17	16	\$10,411	\$13,627	\$8,798	\$13,099	\$251	\$337	\$21	\$86
Age of Head of Household										
18-31	421	284	\$9,284	\$12,198	\$9,320	\$12,473	\$249	\$318	\$21	\$69
32-46	292	289	\$11,734	\$13,598	\$13,162	\$15,548	\$317	\$379	\$17	\$62
47-61	147	131	\$11,600	\$14,830	\$12,667	\$16,465	\$305	\$368	\$27	\$63
Excluded Housholds										
Elderly/Disabled Households	363	358	\$971	\$1,341	\$11,051	\$11,555	\$260	\$267	N/A	N/A

*The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

**"Other" category not available in LHA's computer systems as of May 27, 2014

Activity #1 – Disparate Impact Analysis

HCV Population	Heads of Household		Average Gross Annual Eaned Income		Average Total Annual Adjusted Income		Average TTP		Average Increased Rent Burden	
	FY2013	FY2014*	FY2013	FY2014*	FY2013	FY2014*	FY2013	FY2014*	FY2014 Benchmark	FY2014 Actual*
All Households	1,454	1,430	\$8,632	\$8,626	\$10,501	\$10,325	\$271	\$357	\$35	\$86
Gender										
Female	1,404	1,378	\$8,697	\$8,669	\$10,547	\$10,403	\$273	\$360	\$34	\$87
Male	50	52	\$7,995	\$7,497	\$8,958	\$8,254	\$237	\$271	\$47	\$34
Race (Multiple selections permitted)										
Black	1,183	1,160	\$8,942	\$8,811	\$10,787	\$10,444	\$279	\$360	\$34	\$81
White	277	275	\$7,561	\$7,938	\$9,341	\$9,805	\$242	\$341	\$38	\$99
American Indian / Native Alaskan	5	4	\$6,298	\$4,940	\$7,354	\$7,557	\$189	\$221	\$34	\$32
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	1	2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,264	\$0	\$436	\$0	\$436
Other**	1	-	\$22,260	-	\$0	-	\$50	-	\$100	-
Ethnicity										
Non-Hispanic	1,438	1,410	\$8,654	\$8,605	\$10,475	\$10,294	\$271	\$356	\$35	\$85
Hispanic	16	20	\$10,432	\$10,156	\$12,096	\$12,466	\$306	\$394	\$21	\$88
Age of Head of Household										
18-31	497	386	\$8,258	\$7,821	\$9,035	\$8,513	\$237	\$297	\$42	\$60
32-46	759	824	\$9,231	\$9,351	\$11,774	\$11,499	\$302	\$392	\$29	\$90
47-61	198	220	\$7,579	\$7,324	\$9,238	\$9,104	\$242	\$328	\$38	\$86
Excluded Households										
Elderly/Disabled & Special Partner Households***	1,196	717	\$1,810	\$1,203	\$8,879	\$10,225	\$227	\$320	N/A	N/A

*The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

**"Other" category not available in LHA's computer systems as of May 27, 2014

***The majority of special partner households had been removed from LHA's computer systems as of May 27, 2014 as these families were transitioned out of the Housing Choice Voucher Program through the implementation of a local, non-traditional MTW activity.

Activity #3 – Triennial Recertification of Connie Griffith Towers and HCV Elderly/Disabled Households

1. Plan year in which the activity was first approved and implemented;

Proposed FY 2012 – FY 2013 for Connie Griffith

Implemented January 1, 2012

Activity Expanded FY2014 to HCV Elderly/Disabled on Fixed Incomes

Implemented April 1, 2014

2. Activity Description

The Housing Authority implemented this activity for all 183 units at Connie Griffith Towers, a near elderly high rise, during FY 2012 – FY 2013. The success of that initiative prompted staff to request authority to expand the activity to HCV elderly and disabled families on a fixed income. As the vast majority of elderly and disabled households in the HCV programs rely on fixed-income sources, there is little variation in household income on an annual basis. In reference to this activity, households on a fixed income are defined as any household with any amount of income from a fixed income source like Social Security, SSDI, or pension income.

The LHA was granted approval to create a "local version" of HUD-Form 9886 that is signed by the tenant at the triennial recertification. The form's content has been altered only to extend the expiration period from 15 months to 36 months and to remove any reference that would otherwise indicate it is a federal form. The new form is located at the end of Activity 3 in the FY 2014 Annual MTW Plan. Families are given the opportunity to switch between flat and income-based rent only during triennial recertification.

Households who experience a significant loss of income, an increase in allowable medical expenses, or a change in family composition may request an interim recertification at any time. Households whose income increases \$200 or more must request an interim recertification. Between triennial recertifications, whenever the federal government adjusts benefits paid through fixed-income programs like Social Security and SSI, the LHA reserves the right to adjust resident household incomes and rent payments accordingly.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

Benchmarks for the HUD Standard metrics were not achieved for this activity because Standard HUD metrics were not required in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan.

4. Revised benchmarks or metrics, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact;

See pages 31-36.

5. If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected.

At Connie Griffith Towers, 85% of elderly families rely on at least one fixed income source (Social Security, SSI or pensions). All households residing at Connie Griffith, whether they have fixed income or not, are recertified every three years.

In HCV, 99% of elderly or disabled households receive income from at least one fixed source (Social Security, SSI or pensions). Recertifying these families once every three years instead of annually has resulted in administrative relief for both residents and housing authority staff.

MTW agencies were required to use HUD standard metrics after submission of the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan, therefore HUD standard metrics for FY 2014 reporting do not include HUD standard metrics benchmarks as they were not required in the initial FY2014 Report.

This activity has helped reduce costs and achieve greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures.

Impact: Reducing costs and achieving greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures

Connie Griffith Tower Units	183
Occupied Units	175

Metric	FY 2011 Baseline	FY 2014 Benchmark	FY 2014 Actual*	Data Source
Total number of annual recerts per year	181	61	23 (13%)	WinTen2
# (%) of families requesting / receiving interim recerts	14 (8%)	16 (9%)	34 (19%)	WinTen2
Dollar value of staff time spent processing annual + interim recerts	\$8,717	\$3,545	\$2,622	Management Specialist Interview / Payroll System

*The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

Impact: Assessing the costs / benefits of this activity for residents				
Metric	FY 2011 Baseline	FY 2014 Benchmark	FY 2014 Actual*	Data Source
Avg (Median) gross annual earned income reported by families	\$1,490 (\$0)	\$1,520	\$2,229 (\$0)	WinTen2
Avg (Median) gross annual non-earned income reported by families	\$9,847 (\$9,144)	\$10,040	\$9,697 (\$9,300)	WinTen2
Avg (Median) total annual income reported by families	\$11,337 (\$9,480)	\$11,560	\$11,925 (\$9,924)	WinTen2
Resident satisfaction with change (Likert scale – 5=Low; 10=Medium; 15=High)	N/A	Medium to High (10-15)	N/A**	Focus Group/ Survey
Avg (Median) monthly rent payment of families	\$223 (\$198)	\$227	\$236 (\$209)	WinTen2
*The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.				
**No resident satisfaction survey was done due to a change in evaluation team.				

Impact: Assessing the costs / benefits of this activity for LHA

Metric	FY 2011 Baselines	FY 2014 Benchmark	FY 2014 Actual*	Data Source
Total monthly rent revenue	\$40,416	\$41,220	\$41,345	WinTen2
Estimated costs savings from fewer recerts	N/A	\$5,172	\$6,095	Management Specialist Interview / Payroll System
Employee satisfaction with change (Likert scale – 5=Low; 10=Medium; 15=High)	N/A	Medium to High (10-15)	TBD**	Focus Group/ Survey

*The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

**No resident satisfaction survey was done due to a change in evaluation team.

<u>HCV-Wide Metrics</u>	
	HCV
Households Subject to Rent Reform Activity	664

<i>Impact: Reducing costs and achieving greater cost effectiveness in federal expenditures</i>				
Metric	FY 2013 Baseline*	FY 2014 Benchmark	FY 2014 Actual**	Data Source
Total # of annual recerts per year	741	185	335	WinTen2
# (%) requesting/receiving interim recert	63 (9%)	75 (10%)	61 (9%)	WinTen2
Dollar value of staff time spent processing annual + interim recerts	\$35,376	\$11,523	\$18,216	Management Specialist Interview / Payroll System

* All FY 2013 baseline data is based on a 12-month period ending January 31, 2013 (the most current data available as of the date the Annual Plan was posted for public comment)

** The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

Impact: Assessing the costs / benefits of this activity for residents				
Metric	FY 2013 Baseline*	FY 2014 Benchmark	FY 2014 Actual**	Data Source
Avg (Median) gross annual earned income reported by families	\$996 (\$0)	\$1,015 (\$0)	\$955 (\$0)	WinTen2
Avg (Median) gross annual non-earned income reported by families	\$13,215 (\$10,464)	\$13,475 (\$10,670)	\$11,428 (\$9,012)	WinTen2
Avg (Median) total gross annual income reported by families	\$13,442 (\$10,560)	\$13,721 (\$10,839)	\$12,254 (\$9,348)	WinTen2
Resident satisfaction with change (Likert scale – 5=Low; 10=Medium; 15=High)	TBD	Medium to High (10-15)	N/A***	Focus Group
Avg (Median) monthly TTP of families	\$264 (\$209)	\$269 (\$213)	\$265 (\$212)	WinTen2

* All FY 2013 baseline data is based on a 12-month period ending January 31, 2013 (the most current data available as of the date the Annual Plan was posted for public comment)

** The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

*** No resident satisfaction survey was done due to a change in evaluation team.

Impact: Assessing the costs / benefits of this activity for LHA				
Metric	FY 2013 Baseline*	FY 2014 Benchmark	FY 2014 Actual**	Data Source
Total monthly gross rent revenue (Net rent revenue) from families	\$195,345 (\$103,435)	\$199,250 (\$105,500)	\$217,380 (\$134,101)	WinTen2
Estimated costs savings from fewer recerts	Initial cost of annual + interim recerts = \$35,376	\$23,853	\$17,160	Management Specialist Interview/ Payroll System
Employee satisfaction with change (Likert scale – 5=Low; 10=Medium; 15=High) ²	TBD	Medium to High (10-15)	TBD***	Survey

* All FY 2013 baseline data is based on a 12-month period ending January 31, 2013 (the most current data available as of the date the Annual Plan was posted for public comment)

** The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

*** No resident satisfaction survey was done due to a change in evaluation team.

Type of Activity: Rent Reform - Alternative Recertification Schedule for Elderly/Disabled Households				
CE #1: Agency Cost Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark*	Outcome**	Benchmark Achieved?*
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Public Housing: \$8,091	Public Housing: N/A	Public Housing: \$1,058	Public Housing: TBD
	181 annual recertifications at Connie Griffith at an average cost of \$44.70 each during FY 2011	Expected recertifications at Connie Griffith multiplied by average cost during FY 2014	23 recertifications at Connie Griffith at an average cost of \$46.00 each during FY 2014.	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report
	HCV Program: \$30,800	HCV Program: N/A	HCV Program: \$15,410	HCV Program: TBD
	700 annual recertifications for elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source at an average cost of \$44.00 each during FY 2013	Expected recertifications for elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source multiplied by average cost during FY 2014	335 recertifications for elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source at an average cost of \$46.00 each during FY 2014.	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report
	Agency-Wide: \$38,891	Agency-Wide: N/A	Agency-Wide: \$16,468	Agency-Wide: TBD
	881 public housing and HCV annual recertifications at an average cost of \$44.14 each before implementation of the activity	Expected public housing and HCV recertifications multiplied by average cost during FY 2014	358 public housing and HCV recertifications at an average cost of \$46.00 each during FY 2014.	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report

Data Sources: WinTen2, Emphasys; staff interviews; staff logs; PHA financial records

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

** The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark*	Outcome**	Benchmark Achieved?*
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	Public Housing: 362 hours	Public Housing: N/A	Public Housing: 46 hours	Public Housing: TBD
	181 recertifications at Connie Griffith at an average staff time of 2 hours each during FY 2011	Expected recertifications at Connie Griffith multiplied by average staff time to conduct each during	23 recertifications at Connie Griffith multiplied by average staff time of 2 hours each during FY 2014.	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report

		FY 2014		
	HCV Program: 1,400 hours	HCV Program: N/A	HCV Program: 670 hours	HCV Program: TBD
	700 recertifications for elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source at an average staff time of 2 hours each during FY 2013	Expected recertifications for elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source multiplied by average staff time to conduct each during FY 2014	335 recertifications for elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source multiplied by average staff time of 2 hours each during FY 2014.	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report
	Agency-Wide: 1,762	Agency-Wide: N/A	Agency-Wide: 716 hours	Agency-Wide: TBD
	881 public housing and HCV recertifications at an average staff time of 2 hours each before implementation of the activity	Expected public housing and HCV recertifications multiplied by average staff time to conduct each during FY 2014	358 public housing and HCV recertifications multiplied by average staff time of 2 hours each during FY 2014.	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report

Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys; staff interviews; staff logs; PHA financial records

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

** The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark*	Outcome**	Benchmark Achieved?*
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Public Housing: \$484,992 (\$484,992)	Public Housing: N/A	Public Housing: \$496,140 (\$496,140)	Public Housing: TBD
	Sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from 181 Connie Griffith households as of June 30, 2011	Expected sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from Connie Griffith households as of June 30, 2014	Actual sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from 175 Connie Griffith households as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report
	HCV Program: \$2,712,660 (\$1,637,712)	HCV Program: N/A	HCV Program: \$2,608,560 (\$1,609,212)	HCV Program: TBD
	Sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from 700 elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source as of June 30, 2013	Expected sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source as of June 30, 2014	Actual sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from elderly and/or disabled households with at least one fixed income source as of May 27, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report

	Agency-Wide: \$3,197,652 (\$2,122,704)	Agency-Wide: N/A	Agency-Wide: \$3,104,700 (\$2,105,352)	Agency-Wide: TBD
	Sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from 881 public housing and HCV households before implementation of the activity	Expected sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from public housing and HCV households as of June 30, 2014	Actual sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from public housing and HCV households as of June 30, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report

Data Source: Emphasys

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

** The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

Activity #3 – Disparate Impact Analysis

HCV Population	Heads of Household		Average Gross Annual Earned Income		Average Total Annual Adjusted Income		Average TTP	
	FY 2013	FY 2014*	FY 2013	FY 2014*	FY 2013	FY 2014*	FY 2013	FY 2014*
All Households	741	664	\$996	\$955	\$10,529	\$10,590	\$264	\$265
Gender								
Female	612	568	\$1,070	\$1,038	\$10,604	\$10,664	\$266	\$267
Male	127	96	\$640	\$459	\$10,167	\$10,151	\$255	\$254
Race (Multiple selections permitted)**								
Black	434	401	\$1,229	\$1,246	\$10,742	\$10,762	\$269	\$269
White	306	258	\$669	\$514	\$10,238	\$10,305	\$256	\$258
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	1	-	\$0	-	\$7,016	-	\$176	-
American Indian / Native Alaskan	-	1	-	\$0	-	\$6,692	-	\$167
Asian / Pacific Islander	-	1	-	\$1,760	-	\$19,832	-	\$496
Ethnicity								
Non-Hispanic	740	663	\$997	\$956	\$10,532	\$10,593	\$263	\$265
Hispanic	1	1	\$0	\$0	\$8,216	\$8,492	\$206	\$212

*The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

** Two heads of households elected not to disclose race in FY 2014.

Activity 10) HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs**1. Plan year in which the activity was first approved and implemented;**

Tenant-Based Special Partner Programs was proposed in the LHA's FY2012 – FY2013 MTW Annual Plan and implemented following the approval of the Plan.

2. Activity Description

LHA partners with three social service agencies in the Lexington area to provide stable, tenant-based voucher housing to low-income families while they receive services provided by the partner agency. (LHA partners with an additional six social service agencies that provide designated, fixed housing to low-income families; these partners are addressed in Activity 12 of the FY2014 MTW Annual Plan.) These “special partner programs” serve some of Lexington's most vulnerable low-income populations, those who need wraparound services in order to stabilize their family situation and begin working to increase self-sufficiency. Targeted populations include the mentally ill, the homeless, those recovering from alcohol or drug addiction, and parents who have recently been released from jail.

Through the approval of its FY 2012 – FY 2013 MTW Annual Plan, the LHA received permission to require that participants relinquish their tenant-based voucher at the time they graduate from or otherwise leave the program offered by the special partner, so another family may benefit from the housing and programming offered by the special partner.

The approval of this activity has permitted the LHA to provide an admissions preference to families eligible for and willing to participate in these special partner programs as a condition of continued assistance.

While LHA hopes the majority of these families will subsequently seek unsubsidized housing in the private market, these households will also be eligible to apply for public housing or another HCV voucher (including Family Self-Sufficiency vouchers) through the Authority's normal application procedures.

LHA has not received any complaints from residents or special partner organizations regarding the implementation of this activity. The Housing Authority continues to believe that requiring families to surrender their voucher upon exiting the special partner's programming will maximize the number of families these programs can serve, ultimately increasing both the self-sufficiency of families and the number of housing choices available to low-income households.

As a reasonable accommodation, special participants are permitted to select units that fall under HUD's definition of special housing types. These vouchers assist persons who are homeless, mentally ill, and persons with substance abuse problems in need of voluntary or court-mandated treatment. Some of those program participants are placed in HUD-defined special housing types as stated in the LHA Section 8 Administrative Plan.

3. Benchmarks Not Achieved

Benchmarks for the HUD Standard metrics are incomplete for this activity because Standard HUD metrics were not required in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan.

4. Revised benchmarks or metrics, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact;

See pages 38-43.

5. If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected.

MTW agencies were required to use HUD standard metrics after submission of the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan; therefore HUD standard metrics for FY 2014 reporting are incomplete.

HCV Special Partner	Description of Households Served	Families Selecting Private Market Units
Bluegrass Domestic Violence Program, Inc.	Victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking	25
Bluegrass Regional Mental Health - Mental Retardation Board, Inc.	Persons with severe mental illness or substance abuse diagnoses who have completed treatment and are involved in recovery services	22
Volunteers of America	Homeless individuals and families	25
Total Units		72

Metric	FY 2011 Baseline	FY 2012 - FY 2013 ACTUAL	FY 2014 ACTUAL	Data Source
# of HCV Special Partners	2	2	2	MOU Documentation
# (%) of HCV vouchers allocated to special partners through Tenant-Based Voucher Program	47 (2%)	47 (2%)	47 (2%)	WinTen2
# of families served through special partner program who: a) move to unsubsidized housing, b) apply for permanent HCV voucher, c) move to public housing, d) move to another type of subsidized housing	Not currently tracked	Not currently tracked	A = TBD B = TBD C = TBD D = TBD	Special Partner Monthly Census Survey

CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	0 UNAVAILABLE	0 TBD	TBD	TBD
	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of Activity #10.			
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys, staff interviews, staff logs, PHA financial records				

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average Earned Income of households affected by Activity #10.	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	TBD	TBD
	Households affected by Activity #10 prior to implementation.	Households affected by Activity #10 after to implementation.	Actual households affected by Activity #10.	Explanation to be provided.

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	Number (Percent) of heads of household that are unemployed (prior to implementation of the activity.	Expected number (percent) of heads of household that are unemployed after implementation of the activity.	Actual number (percent) of heads of household that are unemployed after implementation of the activity.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Employment Status for (1) Employed FT: (2)Employed PT: (3)Enrolled in Education Prgrm: (4)Enrolled in JTP: (5)Unemployed: (6)Other:	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	TBD	TBD
	Percent of heads of household that are unemployed (prior to implementation of the Activity #10.	Expected percent of heads of household that are unemployed after implementation of the Activity #10.	Actual percent of heads of household unemployed after implementation of the Activity 10.	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source: Emphasys				

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

SS4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households affected by Activity #10 receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	TBD	TBD
	# of households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the Activity #10.	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the Activity #10.	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the Activity #10.	Explanation to be provided.

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

Type of Activity: Admissions Policy - Direct Referrals				
HC #3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months).	Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Actual average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	60 months	6 months	TBD	TBD
	Average number of months an applicant for one of 3 special partner programs spent on LHA's HCV Program wait list during FY 2011	Expected average number of months an applicant for one of 3 special partner programs will spend on LHA's HCV Program wait list during FY 2015	Actual average number of months an applicant for one of 3 special partner programs will spend on LHA's HCV Program wait list during FY 2015	Explanation to be provided
Data Source: WinTen2; Emphasys				

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

SS8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
For this activity, self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least ¹ \$15,080 per year.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self-after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self-after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	<i>TBD</i>	<i>TBD</i>
	Households transitioned to self-prior to implementation of Activity #10.	Expected households transitioned to self-after implementation of Activity #10.	Actual households transitioned to self-after implementation of Activity #10.	Explanation to be provided
¹ \$15,080 = Federal minimum wage (\$7.25/hour) x 40-hour work week x 52 weeks of work per year				
Data Source: Special Partner reporting.				

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

<i>HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility</i>				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move (decrease). Units reach victims of domestic violence, dating violence, & stalking; persons with severe mental illness or substance abuse diagnoses who have completed treatment & are involved in recovery services; & homeless families	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>TBD</i>	<i>TBD</i>
	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Explanation to be provided

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

Activity 12) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners**1. Plan year in which the activity was first approved and implemented;**

Through the approval of its FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan this activity was implemented in January 2014.

2. Activity Description

LHA partners with seven social service agencies in the Lexington area to provide stable, tenant-based voucher housing to low-income families while they receive services provided by the partner agency. Targeted populations include individuals with mental illness and/or substance abuse issues; individuals recently released from prison or jail; families in need of financial literacy, credit management, and homeownership resources; single parents enrolled full-time in higher education; and homeless individuals and families. Those partners are described in the table below.

Special Partner	Description of Households Served	Families Served
Canaan House	Individuals who have been diagnosed with a mental illness	17
Hope Center (Rouse, Hillrise, HOPE Center for Women and HOPE Center for Men)	Persons who have a substance abuse problem and are in need of voluntary or court-mandated treatment	144
New Beginnings Bluegrass, Inc.	Individuals who have been diagnosed with a mental illness	24
OASIS (Ferrell Square) Rental Assistance Housing Program	Families in need of financial literacy, credit management, and homeownership resources	30
One Parent Scholar House (Virginia Place)	Single parents who are full-time students in a post-secondary educational institution	80
Chrysalis House/Serenity Place	Parents with children: 1) who have recently been released from jail or are homeless and 2) who are substance abuse treatment program graduates	40
Urban League of Lexington-Fayette County (Elm Tree Lane Apts. And G.P. Russell Apts.)	Elderly individuals	23
Total Special Partner Units		358

These partnerships provide service-enriched housing to households while they participate in a program offered by the non-profit organization. This local, non-traditional initiative would permit specified special partner organizations to alter their programs in two specific ways:

1. With Housing Authority approval, special partner organizations are permitted to require that participants reside in designated service-enriched housing units in order to receive rental subsidy; and
2. With Housing Authority approval, special partner organizations are permitted to house program participants in HUD-defined special housing types. Within these special housing type units, partner organizations are also permitted to request Housing Authority approval to house up to two unrelated adults in a zero- or one-bedroom unit.

As a local, non-traditional use of MTW funds activity, LHA has entered into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with each of these special partners and to negotiate a facility monthly rent with each. The MOU includes a description of the special partner's program and the targeted population; an overview of services the special partner will provide; and an enumeration of program goals. The document also includes a list of the basic obligations both the special partner and the Housing Authority have agreed to.

The LHA has no plans at this time to expand either the number of special partners receiving funding or the amount of funding each receives. Should the Housing Authority decide to add additional special partners in the future, publicly available planning and/or assessment documents such as the city's *Consolidated Plan* and the Department of Social Services' *Lexington Social Service Needs Assessment Report*, will be used to determine the unique special populations most in need of subsidized housing that includes on-site supportive services. A public Request for Proposals (RFP) process will then be used to select non-profit partners that serve these populations.

Regardless of whether or not new special partners are added, the LHA will limit the total amount of funding that can be provided to special partners in any given year to 20% of its HCV Program funding.

The MOU for each special partner lists the minimum number of families they must serve during the year. This minimum will equal the average number of families served per month during CY 2012. Thus, the initial subsidy for each participant family will be no more than the average monthly subsidy possible per household during CY 2012. Funding in future years will be adjusted to account for any federal funding pro-ratio experienced by the LHA. In addition, rent reasonableness will be examined at regular intervals, and the facility monthly rate adjusted as necessary to account for local market rent fluctuations.

Since special partners have traditionally operated their housing units at a per unit cost (PUC) approximately 15% below the average PUC for all LHA landlords, the Housing Authority expects that special partner families will be able to capitalize on these PUC savings to serve

approximately 50 additional families (or 405 families total) annually under the proposed funding structure.

Annual tenant household income is calculated per HUD regulations, and each special partner's MOU will state that rents may not exceed 30% of the family's adjusted gross income or the special partner's stated minimum rent. Each partner will be required to supply regular reporting documents and a copy of the facility IPA audit to ensure that families are not charged rents in excess of these limits.

3. **Benchmarks Not Achieved**

Benchmarks for the HUD Standard metrics are incomplete for this activity because Standard HUD metrics were not required in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan.

4. **Revised benchmarks or metrics, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact;**

See pages 46-54.

5. **If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected.**

MTW agencies were required to use HUD standard metrics after submission of the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan; therefore HUD standard metrics for FY 2014 reporting do not include HUD standard metrics benchmarks as they were not required in the initial FY2014 Report.

Metric	FY 2011 Baseline	FY 2012 - FY 2013 Benchmark	FY 2014 Actual	Data Source
# of special partners	8*	8*	7*	MOU Documentation
# of families served through activity	390	390	358	Special partner reporting
MTW funds utilized	N/A	N/A	\$1,479,563/ \$123,2979(monthly)	LHA financial records
Avg MTW funds spent per family served	N/A	N/A	\$313/\$3,756 (annually)	Special partner reporting / LHA financial records

*The number of special partner programs was incorrectly reported in the FY2014 Plan. The FY2014 incorrectly reports Chrysalis House as a special partner program utilizing 40 vouchers. Serenity Place is reported in the FY2014 Plan as a special partner program utilizing 40 vouchers. Chrysalis House is a screening facility prior to being housed at Serenity Place; therefore, Chrysalis House was removed as a separate special partner program and combined with Serenity House.

CE #4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars). This number may be zero.	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Amount leveraged prior to implementation Activity #12.	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	TBD	TBD
	Average earned income of households affected by Activity #12 prior to implementation.	Average earned income of households affected by Activity #12 after implementation.	Actual average earned income of households affected by Activity #12.	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source: WinTen2, Emphasys, staff interviews, staff logs, PHA financial records				

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average Earned Income of households affected by Activity #12.	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	TBD	TBD
	Households affected by Activity #12 prior to implementation.	Households affected by Activity #12 after to implementation.	Actual households affected by Activity #12.	Explanation to be provided.

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

SS #3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	Number (Percent) of heads of household that are unemployed (prior to implementation of the activity).	Expected number (percent) of heads of household that are unemployed after implementation of the activity.	Actual number (percent) of heads of household that are unemployed after implementation of the activity.	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Employment Status for (1) Employed FT: (2) Employed PT: (3) Enrolled in Education Program: (4) Enrolled in JTP: (5) Unemployed: (6) Other:	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	TBD	TBD
	This information is not currently tracked for these categories.			Explanation to be provided.
Data Source: Emphasys				
*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.				

SS4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	TBD	TBD
				Explanation to be provided.

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

Type of Activity: Other - Local Non-Traditional Program (Rental Subsidy)				
SS #5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency (increase).	Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	358	358	358	Yes
	Number of households receiving services through one of 8 special partner programs during FY 2013	Expected number of households receiving services through one of 8 special partner programs during FY 2014	Actual number of households receiving services through one of 8 special partner programs during FY 2014	
Data Source: WinTen2; Emphasys				
*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.				

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	\$344 (\$4,128 annually)	\$344	\$313 (\$3,756 annually)	YES
	Sum total annual subsidy for 355 households in one of 8 special partner programs during FY 2013	Expected sum total annual subsidy for 360 households in one of 8 special partner programs during FY 2014	Actual sum total annual subsidy for households in one of 8 special partner programs during FY 2014	
Data Source: WinTen2; Emphasys; PHA financial records Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.				

SS7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
PHA rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PHA rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual PHA rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	\$2,151,087	N/A
	Rental revenue prior to implementation of Activity #12.	Expected rental revenue after implementation of Activity #12.	Actual rental revenue after implementation of Activity #12.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source: Emphasys Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.				

SS8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
For this activity, self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least ¹ \$15,080 per year.				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase).	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self-after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self-after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	<i>TBD</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	Households transitioned to self-prior to implementation of Activity #12.	Expected households transitioned to self-after implementation of Activity #12.	Actual households transitioned to self-after implementation of Activity #12.	Explanation to be provided
¹ \$15,080 = Federal minimum wage (\$7.25/hour) x 40-hour work week x 52 weeks of work per year				
Data Source: Special Partner reporting. Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.				

HC #5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase).	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual increase in households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity.	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	N/A	N/A
	Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood prior to implementation of as a result of Activity #12.	Expected number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood as a result of Activity #12.	Actual number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood as a result of the Activity #12.	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source: Special Partner reporting. Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.				

HC #6: Increase in Homeownership Opportunities				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households that purchased a home as a result of the activity (increase).	Number of households that purchased a home prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected number of households that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households that purchased a home after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households that purchased a home as a result of Activity #12.	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	N/A	N/A
	Number of households that purchased a home prior to implementation of Activity #12.	Expected number of households that purchased a home after implementation of Activity #12.	Actual number of households that purchased a home after implementation of Activity #12.	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source: Special Partner reporting. Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.				

HC #7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice (increase).	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual number of households receiving these services after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Number of households affected by Activity #12 receiving services aimed to increase housing choice.	0 Unavailable (baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	0	N/A	N/A
	Number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice prior to implementation of Activity #12.	Expected number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice after implementation of Activity #12.	Actual number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice after implementation of Activity #12.	Explanation to be provided.
Data Source: Special Partner reporting. Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.				

Activity 13) Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements

- 1. List approved, implemented, ongoing activities continued from the prior Plan year(s); that are actively utilizing flexibility from the MTW Agreement; specify the Plan Year in which the activity was first approved and implemented;**

This activity was proposed in the FY 2014 Plan and implemented April 1, 2014.

- 2. Provide a description of the activity and detailed information on its impact. Compare outcomes to baselines and benchmarks, and indicate whether the activity is on schedule;**

The LHA re-examined its public housing self-sufficiency program with the aim of eliminating loopholes that a small but significant number of residents use to avoid work requirements. This activity will help to increase family self-sufficiency. As part of this activity the LHA received approval to:

- 1. Impose a minimum earned income calculation for families residing at self-sufficiency units regardless of employment status** – Minimum earned income for the head of household, co-head or spouse is subject to the LHA's self-sufficiency work requirement will be calculated based on the following: *Self-Sufficiency I* units - 52 weeks x 37.5 hours x federal minimum wage; and, *Self-Sufficiency II* units - 52 weeks x 20 hours x federal minimum wage. The amount of assumed annual income will be modified when the federal minimum wage is updated. This requirement is a condition of admissions and continued occupancy for all families who accept self-sufficiency units. Families whose head/co-head is a full-time student is exempt. The total amount of expected earned income is used to calculate annual income in the case of the head of household, co-head or spouse who is expected to earn more than the imputed minimum earned income. LHA will phase in this activity to current tenants living at Self-Sufficiency I units to reduce the financial burden. During the first year all self-sufficiency households will be subject to the minimum earned income based on 20 hours per week, after that time Self-Sufficiency I households will be subject to a minimum earned income based on 37.5 hours per week as there is a work requirement of 37.5 hours per week for these households.
- 2. Modify the Definition of Work Activity** used to determine whether or not a family is compliant with the self-sufficiency requirements. In order to ensure that the employment activities sought by residents will enable them to earn at least the minimum imputed earned income, the LHA sought permission to create a local definition of "work activity," which will limit compliant work activities to paid activities that are most likely to ensure families' incomes at least equal the minimum imputed earned income amount. The majority of the LHA's public housing units have a work requirement based on Self-Sufficiency Level I or Self-Sufficiency Level II requirements. Instead of using the requirements found at 42 USC 607(d), the LHA defines "work activity" as follows:
 - a) Unsubsidized employment;
 - b) Subsidized private sector employment;
 - c) Subsidized public sector employment;

d) Paid on-the-job training.

Authorization to Expand Current Self-Sufficiency Requirements to the Revitalized Pimlico Units

In addition, the LHA received approval to use MTW authority to require Self-Sufficiency Level II Admissions and Continued Occupancy Rules at Pimlico Apartments post-revitalization. Pimlico is a 206-unit public housing site, currently closed and undergoing revitalization through the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program. The majority of Pimlico households accepted Housing Choice Vouchers and waived their right to return to Pimlico following renovation. Eleven (11) Pimlico families have indicated that they wish to return post renovation and will be exempt from these requirements for one year following reoccupancy. When construction at the site is complete the development will operate under the name of Centre Meadows. LHA expects that any returning Centre Meadows households will not be able to do so until the start of FY 2016 when renovation is anticipated to be complete. All households including full-time students - but excluding elderly/disabled families - will be subject to the \$150 minimum rent.

LHA Self-Sufficiency Site	# of Units	Housing Type
Allante Brooke	32	SS I
Atiya Place	18	SS I
Camelot	36	SS I
Georgetown Addition	6	SS I
Catera Trace	23	SSI
Heartsbrook.	34	SS I
Olde Towne	8	SS I
Rosemary	26	SS I
Trent	9	SS I
Wilson 1 (Phase I)	12	SS I
Wilson 2 (Phase II)	17	SS I
Scattered Houses Team I	11	SS I
Scattered Houses Team II	9	SSI
Scattered Houses Team III	15	SSI
Total Self-Sufficiency I Units	256	
12 th Street	40	SS II
Bainbridge Court.	48	SS II
Bridlewood Place.	88	SS II
Constitution Square	17	SS II
Grand Oaks	88	SS II
Pine Valley	32	SS II
Russell Cave	26	SS II
The Shropshire	32	SS II
The Shropshire East	24	SS II
Twin Oaks Park	60	SS II
Falcon Crest	72	Tax Credit/SSII
Georgetown	17	Tax Credit/SSII
Sugar Mill	46	Tax Credit/SSII
Total Self-Sufficiency II Units	590	
Total Self-Sufficiency I and II Units	846	

LHA mailed 90-day notices on July 1, 2013, informing affected households of the requirements for self-sufficiency units. LHA management staff offered a series of resident workshops for affected households during the 90 days prior to implementation of this activity in an effort to educate them on the new self-sufficiency requirements and available community resources. The activity is ongoing.

i. For rent reform activities, describe the number and results of any hardship requests;

To reduce the initial financial burden on families, both new admissions and current families living in Self-Sufficiency I units will be subject to an imputed minimum earned income based on a 20 hour workweek throughout FY 2015. Beginning July 1, 2015, the minimum earned income for these families will be calculated using a 37.5 hour workweek as there is a work requirement of 37.5 hours per week for these households.

3. If benchmarks were not achieved or if the activity was determined ineffective, provide a narrative explanation of the challenges, and, if possible, identify potential new strategies that might be more effective;

Benchmarks for the HUD Standard metrics are incomplete for this activity because Standard HUD metrics were not required in the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan.

4. Revised benchmarks or metrics, identify original indicator(s) and new indicator(s) of activities status and impact;

See pages 58-70.

5. If data collection methodology has changed, describe original data collection methodology and any revisions to the process or change in data collected.

MTW agencies were required to use HUD standard metrics after submission of the FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan; therefore HUD standard metrics for FY 2014 reporting are incomplete.

	Self-Sufficiency	Self-Sufficiency	Pimlico
	/	//	
Occupied Households / Total # Units	252 / 256	567 / 590	0 / 0
Elderly / Disabled Households	41	168	0
Non-Elderly / Non-Disabled Households	211	399	0

Impact: Encouraging non-disabled/non-elderly adult household members to work

Metric	Self-Sufficiency Group	FY 2013 Baseline*	FY 2014 Benchmark**	FY 2014 Actual***	Data Source
Imputed minimum annual earned income	Self-Sufficiency I	N/A	\$7,540	\$7,540	U.S. Department of Labor, Federal Minimum Wage
	Self-Sufficiency II	N/A	\$7,540	\$7,540	
	Pimlico	N/A	Exempt	Site vacant	
Avg (Median) gross annual earned income reported by families	Self-Sufficiency I	\$16,555 (\$16,653)	\$18,457 (\$16,653)	\$18,140 (\$17,503)	WinTen2
	Self-Sufficiency II	\$11,012 (\$10,460)	\$13,497 (\$10,460)	\$12,486 (\$11,700)	
	Pimlico	\$3,395 (\$0)	Exempt	Site vacant	
# (%) of families reporting no annual earned income	Self-Sufficiency I	44 (21%)	0 (0%)	46 (22%)	WinTen2
	Self-Sufficiency II	118 (28%)	0 (0%)	93 (23%)	
	Pimlico	98 (67%)	0 (0%)	Site vacant	
# (%) of families reporting annual earned income less than minimum imputed earned income	Self-Sufficiency I	61 (29%)	0 (0%)	54 (26%)	WinTen2
	Self-Sufficiency II	159 (38%)	0 (0%)	130 (33%)	
	Pimlico	114 (78%)	0 (0%)	Site vacant	
Avg (Median) total adjusted annual income reported by families	Self-Sufficiency I	\$16,431 (\$14,652)	\$18,333 (\$16,246)	\$18,882 (\$16,774)	WinTen2
	Self-Sufficiency II	\$12,101 (\$11,184)	\$14,587 (\$13,148)	\$13,953 (\$11,708)	
	Pimlico	\$4,340 (\$2,400)	Exempt	Site vacant	
Avg (Median) monthly gross rent payment of families	Self-Sufficiency I	\$380 (\$387)	\$427 (\$407)	\$426 (\$419)	WinTen2
	Self-Sufficiency II	\$297 (\$281)	\$358 (\$330)	\$345 (\$293)	
	Pimlico	\$179 (\$150)	Exempt	Site vacant	
# (%) of families requesting hardship exemption	Self-Sufficiency I	N/A	21 (10%)	0	Property Manager Log
	Self-Sufficiency II	N/A	42 (10%)	0	
	Pimlico	N/A	Exempt	Site vacant	
# (%) of families granted hardship exemption	Self-Sufficiency I	N/A	11 (5%)	0	WinTen2 / Property Manager Log
	Self-Sufficiency II	N/A	21 (5%)	0	
	Pimlico	N/A	Exempt	Site vacant	

* All FY 2013 baseline data is based on a 12-month period ending January 31, 2013 (the most current data available as of the date the Annual Plan was posted for public comment)

** FY 2014 benchmarks account for the impact of LHA's planned minimum rent increase to \$150 for all non-disabled / non-elderly public housing families

***The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

Impact: Assessing the costs / benefits of this activity for LHA

Metric	Study Group	FY 2013 Baseline*	FY 2014 Benchmark**	FY 2014 Actual***	Data Source
Total gross monthly (Net monthly) rent revenue	Self-Sufficiency I	\$79,737 (\$51,987)	\$102,088 (\$74,338)	\$89,817 (\$62,821)	WinTen2
	Self-Sufficiency II	\$125,879 (\$79,608)	\$151,638 (\$105,367)	\$137,490 (\$99,380)	
	Pimlico	\$26,109 (\$10,914)	Exempt	Site vacant	
Dollar value of staff time spent processing hardship requests	Self-Sufficiency I	N/A	\$493	0	Payroll System / Staff Interviews
	Self-Sufficiency II	N/A	\$986	0	
	Pimlico	N/A	Exempt	Site vacant	
* All FY 2013 baseline data is based on a 12-month period ending January 31, 2013 (the most current data available as of the date the Annual Plan was posted for public comment)					
** FY 2014 benchmarks account for the impact of LHA’s planned minimum rent increase to \$150 for all non-disabled / non-elderly public housing families					
*The LHA’s fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.					

SS #1: Increase in Household Income				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark*	Outcome**	Benchmark Achieved?*
Average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars (increase).	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<i>Self-Sufficiency I/II: \$12,800</i>	<i>Self-Sufficiency I/II: N/A</i>	<i>Self-Sufficiency I/II: \$14,442</i>	<i>Self-Sufficiency I/II: TBD</i>
	Average gross annual earned income from 648 non-disabled/non-elderly households as of June 30, 2013	Expected average gross annual earned income from non-disabled/non-elderly households as of June 30, 2014	Actual average gross annual earned income from 610 non-disabled/non-elderly households as of June 30, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report
	<i>Pimlico/Centre Meadows: \$2,172</i>	<i>Pimlico/Centre Meadows: N/A</i>	<i>Pimlico/Centre Meadows: Site vacant</i>	<i>Pimlico/Centre Meadows: N/A</i>
	Average gross annual earned income from 152 non-disabled/non-elderly households as of June 30, 2011	Centre Meadows will remain vacant for renovations during FY 2014	Centre Meadows was vacant for renovations during FY 2014	Centre Meadows was vacant for renovations during FY 2014

SS3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category:	Head(s) of households in SSI, SSII and Pimlico/Centre Meadows sites prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in SSI, SSII and Pimlico/Centre Meadows sites after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual head(s) of households in SSI, SSII and Pimlico/Centre Meadows sites after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Report the following information separately for each category:	Self-Sufficiency I/II & Centre Meadows	Self-Sufficiency I/II & Centre Meadows	Self-Sufficiency I/II & Centre Meadows	Self-Sufficiency I/II & Centre Meadows
(1)Employed Full-Time; (2)Employed Part-Time; (3)Enrolled in Education Program; (4)Enrolled in Job Training Program; (5)Unemployed; (6)Other	This information is currently not tracked for these categories: 1,2,3,4,5 and 6.	N/A*	This information is currently not tracked for these categories: 1,2,3,4,5 and 6.	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report.

SS #4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark*	Outcome**	Benchmark Achieved?*
Number of households receiving TANF assistance (decrease).	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity (number)	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	<i>Self-Sufficiency I/II: 26</i>	<i>Self-Sufficiency I/II: N/A</i>	<i>Self-Sufficiency I/II: 25</i>	<i>Self-Sufficiency I/II: TBD</i>
	Non-disabled/non-elderly households receiving TANF as of June 30, 2013	Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households receiving TANF	Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households receiving TANF	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Annual Plan
	<i>Pimlico/Centre Meadows: Unknown</i>	<i>Pimlico/Centre Meadows: N/A</i>	<i>Pimlico/Centre Meadows: N/A</i>	<i>Pimlico/Centre Meadows: N/A</i>
	Non-disabled/non-elderly households receiving TANF as of June 30, 2011	Centre Meadows will remain vacant for renovations during FY 2014	Centre Meadows was vacant for renovations during FY 2014	Centre Meadows was vacant for renovations during FY 2014
Data Source: Emphasys				

*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.

** The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	**Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	SSI/SSII Households			
	0	TBD	\$3,519	TBD
	Unavailable	Unavailable		
	(baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	(baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)		
	Pimlico/Centre Meadows Households			
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by the local self-sufficiency admissions and occupancy requirements in dollars (decrease).	0	TBD	Centre Meadows was vacant for renovations during FY 2014	TBD
	Unavailable	Unavailable		
	(baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	(baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)		
	Average subsidy per household affected by the local self-sufficiency admissions and occupancy requirements prior to implementation of the activity.	Expected average subsidy per household affected by the local self-sufficiency admissions and occupancy requirements after implementation of the activity.	Actual average subsidy per household affected by the local self-sufficiency admissions and occupancy requirements after implementation of the activity.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source: Emphasys				

SS #6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	**Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars (decrease).	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	SSI/SSII Households			
	0	TBD		N/A
	Unavailable	Unavailable		
	(baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	(baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)		
	Pimlico/Centre Meadows Households			
Average amount of Section 8 and/or 9 subsidy per household affected by the local self-sufficiency admissions and occupancy requirements in dollars (decrease).	0	TBD		N/A
	Unavailable	Unavailable		
	(baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)	(baseline data unavailable and/or not currently tracked)		
	Average subsidy per household affected by the local self-sufficiency admissions and occupancy requirements prior to implementation of the activity.	Expected average subsidy per household affected by the local self-sufficiency admissions and occupancy requirements after implementation of the activity.	Actual average subsidy per household affected by the local self-sufficiency admissions and occupancy requirements after implementation of the activity.	Explanation to be provided
Data Source: Emphasys				

SS #7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark*	Outcome**	Benchmark Achieved?*
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	Self-Sufficiency I/II: \$2,467,392 (\$1,579,140)	Self-Sufficiency I/II: N/A	Self-Sufficiency I/II: \$2,727,684 (\$1,946,412)	Public Housing: *N/A
	Actual sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from 634 non-elderly/non-disabled Self-Sufficiency I/II households as of June 30, 2013	Expected sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from non-elderly/non-disabled Self-Sufficiency I/II households as of June 30, 2014	Actual sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from 610 non-elderly/non-disabled Self-Sufficiency I/II households as of June 30, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report
	Pimlico / Centre Meadows: Unknown	Pimlico / Centre Meadows: N/A	Pimlico / Centre Meadows: N/A	Pimlico / Centre Meadows: *N/A
	Actual sum total annual gross (net) rental revenue from non-elderly/non-disabled Self-Sufficiency I/II households as of June 30, 2011	Centre Meadows will remain vacant for renovations during FY 2014	Centre Meadows was vacant for renovations during FY 2014	Centre Meadows was vacant for renovations during FY 2014
Data Source: Emphasys				
*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.				
** The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.				

SS #8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency

For this activity, self-sufficiency is defined as any household that has earned income of at least \$15,080 per year and has paid their rent on-time for the past 12 months

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark*	Outcome**	Benchmark Achieved?*
Number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self-sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity (number).	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
	Self-Sufficiency I/II: 48	Self-Sufficiency I/II: N/A	Self-Sufficiency I/II: 34	Self-Sufficiency I/II: *N/A
	Non-disabled/non-elderly households meeting definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2013	Expected non-disabled/non-elderly households transitioned to self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2014	Actual non-disabled/non-elderly households meeting definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2014	Explanation to be provided in FY 2015 Report
	Pimlico/Centre Meadows: Unknown	Pimlico/Centre Meadows: N/A	Pimlico/Centre Meadows: *N/A	Pimlico/Centre Meadows: *N/A
	Non-disabled/non-elderly households meeting definition of self-sufficiency as of June 30, 2011	Centre Meadows will remain vacant for renovations during FY 2014	Centre Meadows was vacant for renovations during FY 2014	Centre Meadows was vacant for renovations during FY 2014
Data Source: Emphasys				
*Benchmarks were not set for this metric because HUD Standard metrics were not required for the FY 2014 Plan.				
** The LHA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, however, software conversion from Tenmast to Emphasys took place on June 1, 2014. Therefore, LHA is using data from Tenmast ending May 27, 2014.				

Activity 13: Pimlico						
Disparate Impact Analysis - Baseline Data						
Pimlico Population	Heads of Household	Average Total Adjusted Annual Income	Average Gross Annual Earned Income	Average Imputed Gross Annual Earned Income Increase	Average Gross Rent Payment	Average Increased Rent Burden
	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2014 Benchmark</i>	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2014 Benchmark</i>
All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households	6	\$5,900	\$2,904	Exempt	\$175	Exempt
Gender of Head of Household						
Female	4	\$6,016	\$4,357	Exempt	\$181	Exempt
Male	2	\$5,668	\$0	Exempt	\$165	Exempt
Race of Head of Household <i>(Multiple selections permitted)</i>						
Black	2	\$5,668	\$0	Exempt	\$165	Exempt
White	3	\$5,045	\$2,513	Exempt	\$167	Exempt
American Indian / Native Alaskan	-	-	-	Exempt	-	Exempt
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	\$8,929	\$9,886	Exempt	\$223	Exempt
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	-	-	-	Exempt	-	Exempt
Other / Not Disclosed	-	-	-	Exempt	-	Exempt
Ethnicity of Head of Household						
Non-Hispanic	6	\$5,900	\$2,904	Exempt	\$175	Exempt
Hispanic	-	-	-	Exempt	-	Exempt
Age of Head of Household						
18 - 31	3	\$6,059	\$2,513	Exempt	\$167	Exempt
32 - 46	1	\$8,929	\$9,886	Exempt	\$223	Exempt
47 - 61	2	\$4,148	\$0	Exempt	\$165	Exempt
Excluded Households						
Elderly/Disabled Households	5	\$9,982	\$0	N/A	\$250	N/A

Disparate Impact Analysis - Baseline Data						
Self-Sufficiency I Population	Heads of Household	Average Total Adjusted Annual Income	Average Gross Annual Earned Income	Average Imputed Gross Annual Earned Income Increase	Average Gross Rent Payment	Average Increased Rent Burden
	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2014 Benchmark</i>	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2014 Benchmark</i>
All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households	210	\$16,431	\$16,555	\$1,902	\$380	\$47
Gender of Head of Household						
Female	201	\$16,399	\$16,525	\$1,912	\$378	\$47
Male	9	\$17,154	\$17,228	\$1,676	\$426	\$36
Race of Head of Household <i>(Multiple selections permitted)</i>						
Black	170	\$16,581	\$16,281	\$2,037	\$387	\$49
White	39	\$17,164	\$18,048	\$1,362	\$365	\$34
American Indian / Native Alaskan	1	\$5,184	\$29,827	\$0	\$130	\$20
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	\$10,090	\$20,313	\$0	\$278	\$50
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other / Not Disclosed	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ethnicity of Head of Household						
Non-Hispanic	204	\$16,511	\$16,508	\$1,921	\$381	\$47
Hispanic	6	\$13,711	\$18,145	\$1,257	\$351	\$26
Age of Head of Household						
18 - 31	88	\$13,189	\$13,760	\$2,164	\$312	\$53
32 - 46	88	\$17,554	\$17,177	\$2,124	\$405	\$52
47 - 61	34	\$21,916	\$22,179	\$649	\$489	\$18
Excluded Households						
Elderly/Disabled Households	35	\$15,369	\$4,429	N/A	\$343	N/A

Activity 13: Self-Sufficiency II Disparate Impact Analysis - Baseline Data						
Self-Sufficiency II Population	Heads of Household	Average Total Adjusted Annual Income	Average Gross Annual Earned Income	Average Imputed Gross Annual Earned Income Increase	Average Gross Rent Payment	Average Increased Rent Burden
	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2014 Benchmark</i>	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2014 Benchmark</i>
All Non-Elderly/Non-Disabled Households¹	419 (of 424)	\$12,101	\$11,012	\$2,486	\$297	\$61
Gender of Head of Household						
Female	379	\$11,813	\$10,848	\$2,485	\$294	\$61
Male	40	\$15,238	\$13,450	\$2,049	\$340	\$47
Race of Head of Household (Multiple selections permitted)						
Black	351	\$12,244	\$11,051	\$2,515	\$300	\$60
White	71	\$11,594	\$11,363	\$2,026	\$289	\$53
American Indian / Native Alaskan	1	\$5,400	\$7,800	\$0	\$135	\$15
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	\$5,400	\$7,800	\$0	\$135	\$15
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	3	\$9,186	\$10,826	\$0	\$230	\$5
Other / Not Disclosed	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ethnicity of Head of Household						
Non-Hispanic	415	\$12,129	\$11,057	\$2,467	\$298	\$60
Hispanic	4	\$13,246	\$15,145	\$0	\$332	\$4
Age of Head of Household						
18 - 31	223	\$10,494	\$10,459	\$2,314	\$268	\$58
32 - 46	137	\$13,416	\$11,295	\$2,706	\$321	\$65
47 - 61	59	\$15,397	\$13,044	\$2,320	\$360	\$54
Excluded Households						
Elderly/Disabled Households	153	\$10,371	\$597	N/A	\$260	N/A
¹ Demographic data not available for 5 Self-Sufficiency II households.						

NOT YET IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES

Activity 5) Streamlined HQS Inspection Policy for Housing Choice Voucher Units

1. List any approved activities that were proposed in the Plan, approved by HUD, but not implemented; specify the Plan Year in which the activity was first approved;

This activity was proposed and approved upon approval of the FY2012 – FY2013 Plan and significantly modified in the FY2014 Plan.

Until July 1, 2014, HUD regulations mandated that housing authorities inspect every HCV unit at least annually to ensure they meet Housing Quality Standards (HQS). Section 220 of the 2014 Appropriations Act now allows housing authorities to inspect assisted housing units in the HCV program biennially, rather than annually. At the time this activity was introduced HUD regulations required annual inspections of every HCV unit to ensure they met Housing Quality Standards (HQS). The LHA still sees benefit in the rating system for landlords to identify landlords with the most at-risk/problematic properties and inspect them more frequently to address HQS issues. LHA continues to uphold HUD's high standards of decent, safe, and sanitary housing maintained in good repair for all HCV households, the Authority believes it can achieve this outcome more cost-effectively through a new *Star Rating System* for HCV property owners.

The new protocol evaluates owners on multiple factors including:

- Past inspection scores;
- Results of new drive-by inspections;
- Proportion of units that have been abated in the past; and
- Past complaints reported by voucher holders

These factors are used to assign a *Star Rating* from one ★ through five ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ stars to each landlord. These ratings are then be used to determine the quantity and frequency of future inspections.

LEXINGTON-FAYETTE URBAN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY FIVE-STAR INSPECTION PROGRAM

Landlord Star Rating	Inspection Intervals	Charges	Drive-By Inspections
★	12-month interval between HQS inspections	In addition to the rating-based inspection fees, the following charges will be assessed to 1 – 3 star landlords –	Subject to quarterly, random drive-by inspections
★★	24-month interval between HQS inspections	\$75.00 for each abatement	Subject to quarterly, random drive-by inspections
★★★	30-month interval between HQS inspections	\$75.00 for the second consecutive missed appointment \$5.00 for each missing or inoperable smoke detector	Subject to quarterly, random drive-by inspections
★★★★	36month interval between HQS inspections	N/A	N/A
★★★★★	42 month interval between HQS inspections	N/A	N/A

NEW LANDLORDS

All new contracts require an initial inspection. Based on the results of this inspection and an analysis of the owner's inspection history, the unit will then be assigned to star category 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5. This rating will determine when the next inspection is due. Landlords new to the program initially default to the two-star category and remain in this rating category until the LHA can collect sufficient historical data to assign them appropriately.

QUALITY CONTROL

As the LHA has 2,405 authorized MTW HCV units, HUD recommends the Housing Authority conduct a minimum of 32 quality control inspections each year. For the purposes of evaluating this activity the LHA plans to conduct a minimum of 50 quality control inspections annually, which we believe will provide ample data to statistically evaluate the program. The LHA will consult periodically with its Evaluation Team to ensure that sampling sizes are adequate to render statistically valid results.

2. Discuss any actions taken toward implementation during the fiscal year.

This activity was not implemented in FY2014, however LHA began rating landlords and scheduling inspections based on those ratings began in June of 2014. the process of actually

scheduling of the actual inspection process did not take place in FY2014 due to a change in software programs used to rate and track inspections. The LHA inspection staff is optimistic about the rating system and expects to see positive results of the star rating program as more data is gathered during FY2015.

Activity 7) Public Housing Acquisition Without Prior HUD Approval

- 1. List any approved activities that were proposed in the Plan, approved by HUD, but not implemented; specify the Plan Year in which the activity was first approved;** Public Housing Acquisition Without Prior HUD Approval was proposed in the LHA's initial MTW application in FY2011 and approved in the FY 2012-2013 MTW Annual Plan. However, the LHA did not acquire any public housing properties during FY 2012 – FY 2013, so this activity was not implemented. Should the Housing Authority decide to acquire any public housing properties during FY 2015, the activity will be implemented at that time.

Relief from HUD approvals prior to the acquisition of property will enhance LHA's ability to respond quickly to unique market conditions, making the Authority more competitive with other purchasers in the tight real estate markets typical of low poverty areas of the city. For example, sellers are not always willing to provide the agency with an option of long enough duration to cover the typical amount of time LHA requires to obtain HUD approval for site acquisition.

This relief will apply only to the acquisition of public housing units or vacant land purchased for the development of public housing units in non-impacted areas of the city.

All acquired properties will meet HUD's site selection requirements. Approval from the local HUD office will be sought when a pending real estate acquisition deviates from the selection requirements. Copies of all required forms and appraisals will be maintained at the Authority's main office. After acquisition, all required documentation will also be provided to the HUD field office so HUD officials can ensure that site selection requirements were met and establish records for these new public housing properties in the agency's data systems.

- 2. Discuss any actions taken toward implementation during the fiscal year.**
No actions were taken during FY2014 to reactivate this activity.

Activity 8) Conversion of Appian Hills Public Housing to Project-Based Vouchers

- 1. List any approved activities that were proposed in the Plan, approved by HUD, but not implemented; specify the Plan Year in which the activity was first approved;** Conversion of Appian Hills Public Housing to Project-Based Vouchers was proposed in the LHA's FY 2012 – FY 2013 Annual Plan and originally included the Pimlico public housing site. In December 2012 the LHA was notified it had received approval to participate in HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) for the 206-unit Pimlico public housing

development. The Housing Authority still plans to use the MTW authorizations associated with this activity to convert Appian Hills to project-based vouchers. However, this conversion has been put on hold, so that available financial resources can be focused on the rehabilitation of Pimlico.

While Appian Hills in recent years received \$500,000 in ARRA-funded energy improvements (cool roofing materials, new doors, and high-efficiency furnaces and water heaters), this 1970's turnkey development still needs extensive capital improvements – including façade improvements, new windows, insulation in the exterior walls, and soundproofing between units. As part of this renovation, LHA will explore various ways to reconfigure the site's 27 four-bedroom homes. While LHA currently has an adequate number of multi-bedroom homes in its housing stock, the agency is in desperate need of one-bedroom units.

LHA continues to work diligently to secure adequate funding to revitalize the Appian Hills public housing development. This site may be rehabilitated in its entirety or in phases, as determined by the Authority. Once a plan for revitalization is agreed upon that includes the substitution of project-based vouchers for public housing subsidies, LHA will submit an appropriate application for disposition of the affected portion(s) of the site as well as a request for tenant protection vouchers for residents of affected units.

Once the disposition has been approved, LHA plans to sell disposed units to one or more non-profit affiliate entities and use its MTW flexibilities to:

- Exceed the 25% cap on the number of project-based units allowed at a property and project-base 100% of the units at this site and
- Waive the requirement to assign project-based assistance to these units through a competitive bidding process, as is allowable using MTW flexibilities in instances where the housing authority is project-basing units at properties owned by the authority or an affiliate entity.

2. Discuss any actions taken toward implementation during the fiscal year.

No actions were taken during FY2014 to reactivate this activity.

Activity 9) Development of Project-Based Voucher Units at 800 Edmond Street**1. List any approved activities that were proposed in the Plan, approved by HUD, but not implemented; specify the Plan Year in which the activity was first approved;**

Development of Project-Based Voucher Units at 800 Edmond Street was proposed in the LHA's FY2012-FY2013 MTW Annual Plan, but has since been put on hold so that available financial resources can be focused on the rehabilitation of Pimlico. However, LHA still plans to implement this activity once financial resources become available.

When initially proposed, LHA planned to develop between five and eight projected-based 3-bedroom townhomes on a vacant lot owned by the agency on Edmond Street. The property is adjacent to an existing 3-unit public housing site and close to the Authority's Pine Valley Management Office.

The Authority considered allocating dollars from its program income fund, which in turn would be funded through property sales and the collection of development fees associated with the implementation of its previous HOPE VI grants for Charlotte Court and Bluegrass-Aspendale. Alternatively, LHA may consider seeking outside funds from a non-federal source.

The flexibilities provided through this MTW activity would be used to project-base the units at Edmond Street without a competitive process and to exceed the per-building cap typically placed on project-based voucher developments. Current project-based voucher rules limit percentage of project-based units to 25% of the units in the development. The LHA would most likely project-base 100% of the units at this site.

2. Discuss any actions taken toward implementation during the fiscal year.

No actions were taken during FY2014 to reactivate this activity.

Activity 11) Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds: Emergency Reserves for Connie Griffith-Ballard Towers**1. List any approved activities that were proposed in the Plan, approved by HUD, but not implemented; specify the Plan Year in which the activity was first approved;**

This activity was proposed in the FY 2012 – FY 2013 Annual Plan. The LHA requested MTW flexibility to permit the use of MTW funds to make physical improvements at Ballard Place, a 134 unit high-rise, tax-credit property designated for elderly persons. The building shares a common entrance and lobby with Connie Griffith Manor, a 183-unit high-rise, public housing property for elderly persons. The LHA did not implement this activity because staff saw a need to modify the activity to permit the use of MTW funds for significant emergency capital repairs, should the property's reserve funds be either insufficient or unavailable to cover the full cost of these repairs. The activity's title and description was revised in the FY 2014 Annual Plan from Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds to Improve Connie Griffith-Ballard Towers" to the current activity title.

LHA currently manages two high rise elderly buildings that include – Ballard Place, a 134-unit, tax-credit and Connie Griffith Manor, a 183-unit building. The buildings are connected by a common entrance and lobby including community space. To expand on the history of the two properties – Connie Griffith Manor, a public housing high-rise property for the elderly, was built by LHA in approximately 1968. Ballard Place, a Section 8-assisted property, was built by LHA in approximately 1978 and sold to Ballard Place, LLC, an entity related to LHA, in 1998. Ballard Place was renovated, in part, using equity raised from the syndication of low-income housing tax credits. Upon the expiration of the fifteen-year tax credit compliance period, the managing member of this LLC will be able to obtain title to the property and is expected ultimately to return the property to LHA.

These two properties initially were separated by an access road that led to a parking lot. In 1998, Connie Griffith Manor underwent a major renovation of some \$10 million with HUD Major Reconstruction of Obsolete Project (MROP) public housing funds; that renovation created a connector between the two buildings, creating one main entrance/receiving lobby. HUD approved the design concept knowing that these two buildings had separate funding mechanisms. The complex was renamed Connie Griffith-Ballard Towers, denoting one facility, and has served the tenants of both buildings well. Tenants were and are still unaware of the separate funding mechanisms – they see themselves as living in a single desirable complex.

When the LHA initially proposed this activity in its FY 2012 – FY 2013 Annual Plan the Authority did not have a confirmed funding source for sorely needed capital improvements that were needed at the time. After the activity was approved, the site's tax credit investors informed the LHA that they would indeed have sufficient funds to complete the needed work. Having spent a significant portion of their reserves to fund these improvements the Housing Authority is concerned about their ability to cover any additional emergency capital repairs.

Given these developments, the LHA received approval to modify this activity through its FY 2014 MTW Annual Plan. Although MTW funds were no longer needed to complete the capital improvements initially proposed through this activity, the LHA wanted to retain the flexibility to use MTW funds should Ballard require significant emergency capital repairs. MTW funds will only be used if the tax credit investor can demonstrate to the Authority's satisfaction that it does not have the financial resources to complete the repairs itself.

In the fall of 2009 LHA had to deal with an infestation of bedbugs in Ballard & Griffith Towers. Necessary treatment expenses totaled \$102,453, which was taken from Ballard Place, LLC reserves. Any unforeseen future bug infestation might result in a financial hardship for the property, which might necessitate the use of the proposed MTW emergency reserves. Despite the number/extent of unforeseen capital emergencies that might arise, Ballard Place will be provided no more than \$300,000 in emergency funds in total.

While HUD has not required broader uses of funds activities carried out by other MTW agencies to relate to the public housing or Section 8 programs or to those programs' beneficiaries, in this case there is a strong relationship. As Ballard Place falls outside of the

Section 8 (Housing Choice Voucher) and Section 9 (Public Housing) programs, LHA requires MTW flexibility to permit the use of MTW funds fund significant emergency capital repairs, should the property's reserve funds be either insufficient or unavailable to cover the full cost of these repairs.

2. Discuss any actions taken toward implementation during the fiscal year.

No actions were taken during FY2014 to reactivate this activity.

ACTIVITIES CLOSED OUT

Activity 4) Housing Choice Voucher Rent Reform Controlled Study – No Rent Reduction Requests for 6 Months After Initial Occupancy

1. Approved activities that have been closed out, including activities that have never been implemented, that the PHA does not plan to implement and obsolete activities; specify the Plan Year in which the activity was first approved and implemented (if applicable); A. Activity Continued from Prior Plan Year(s)

The HCV Rent Reform Controlled Study – No Rent Reduction Requests for 6 Months After Initial Occupancy was proposed in the LHA's initial MTW application in FY2011 and was implemented following approval of the FY 2012-2013 MTW Annual Plan.

2. Provide the year the activity was closed out; and Activity Description

The activity was closed out in FY 2014.

3. In the year the activity was closed out provide the following:

i. Final Outcome and Lessons Learned

Households sometimes take a new job or increase the number of hours they work just before requesting a Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) or moving with an HCV, so they will qualify to rent a unit whose gross rent exceeds LHA's payment standard without violating the statutory requirement that the rent they pay may not exceed 40% of their monthly adjusted income. Shortly after moving into a unit, they then reduce their hours or quit their job and apply for a reduction in their portion of the payment standard (i.e., a rent reduction, which leaves LHA paying an increased portion of the payment standard).

The LHA encourages families to carefully consider what kind of rent their household can truly afford to pay on an ongoing basis. To ensure that families base this decision on an accurate depiction of their expected income, LHA now prohibits families from requesting a rent reduction for six months after their initial move-in date. Instead, these families are subject to the MTW Rent Reform Hardship Policy as stated in Appendix C of the FY2014 MTW Annual Plan.

Elderly and disabled households were exempt from this rent reform initiative, and continued to be eligible to request a rent reduction according to LHA's current policies.

This activity restricted HCV households from requesting a rent reduction for six months after their effective move-in date. The implementation of this activity did not reduce the percentage of families requesting a rent reduction within 6 months of their effective move-in date. In fact, the percentage of families making such a request rose from 10% to 18% during FY2012 – FY2013. For those reasons, the LHA has decided to terminate this activity.

ii. Describe any statutory exceptions outside of the current MTW flexibilities that might have provided additional benefit for this activity;

The FY 2014 Annual Plan included a new activity, which proposed to increase the minimum rent for these families (and all other HCV tenants) from \$50 to \$150. The Housing Authority anticipates this activity will prove a more successful alternative for encouraging these households to maintain a consistent level of employment.

In addition, the LHA has agreed to participate in a rent reform study commissioned by HUD's Office of Policy Development & Research that targets eligible work-able non-elderly/non-disabled HCV households.

iii. Summary table, listing outcomes from each year of the activity (since the execution of the Standard MTW Agreement); and

Metric	Study Group	FY2011*	FY2013	FY2014
Avg annual earned income reported by families at initial occupancy ¹	Control:	Not Available	\$6,222	\$3,313
	Treatment:		\$6,222	\$6,369
Avg monthly TTP at initial occupancy ¹	Control:	Not Available	\$239	\$233
	Treatment:		\$239	\$225
Avg gross annual earned income reported by families	Control:	\$4,645	\$8,633	\$3,913
	Treatment:		\$8,633	\$5,891
Avg total adjusted annual income reported by families	Control:	\$12,602	Unavailable	\$8,836
	Treatment:		\$10,501	\$10,011
Avg TTP of families	Control:	\$141 (Net)		\$279
	Treatment:		\$271 (Gross)	\$285
# (%) of families requesting a) rent reduction (control) b) hardship exemption (treatment) within 6 months of move-in	Control:	81 (10%)	7 (10%)	7 (10%)
	Treatment:		1 (2%)	5(8%)
Total monthly HAP	Control:	\$1,320,599	\$660,300	\$213,480
	Treatment:			\$159,000
Dollar value of staff time spent processing of	Control:	\$1,358	\$670	\$453

a) rent reduction requests (control group) b) hardship exemptions (treatment group) within 6 months of move-in	Treatment:		\$134	0
Resident satisfaction with activity (Likert scale – 5=Low; 10=Medium; 15=High)	Control:	Not Available	Medium (10)	**Not Available
	Treatment:		Low (5)	**Not Available
Employee satisfaction with activity (Likert scale – 5=Low; 10=Medium; 15=High)	Control:	Not Available	Medium	**Not Available
	Treatment:			

¹FY 2012 – FY 2013 “at initial occupancy” benchmarks have been updated to reflect admissions for the 12-month period ending January 31, 2013 (the most current data available as of the date the Annual Plan was posted for public comment). Historic data of this kind was not available at the time the original FY 2011 baselines were calculated.

*FY 2011 baselines were also calculated using net values for earned income and TTP metrics. As the metrics for all other MTW activities use the gross values of these numbers, FY 2012 – FY 2013 and FY 2014 benchmarks now use gross values.

** No resident satisfaction survey was done due to a change in evaluation team.

iv. Provide a narrative for additional explanations about outcomes reported in the summary table.

At the time FY 2011 baselines were calculated, LHA had not yet determined a method to correctly denote elderly / disabled “families” in order to exclude them from baseline calculations. Instead, any family containing either an elderly or disabled adult member was excluded from the baseline calculation. FY 2012 – FY 2013 and FY 2014 benchmarks estimates now correctly exclude elderly / disabled families (not elderly / disabled individuals).

Baseline numbers reported for this activity include all HCV households (almost 2,500 households) not excluding elderly and disabled due to software issues - but there were only 27 treatment group households in FY 2014. It's such a small subset that the baseline & outcome numbers aren't even close in most cases. The FY2014 treatment group number of 27 (2%) families is so small in proportion to the total eligible HCV population of approximately 1,250; LHA cannot draw accurate conclusions for either group.

Activity 4: Housing Choice Voucher Rent Reform Controlled Study – No Rent Reduction Requests for 6 Months After Initial Occupancy										
Disparate Impact Analysis	Heads of Household		Average Gross Earned Income per Month at Initial Occupancy		Average Gross Monthly Income		Average TTP		Average HAP	
Total HCV Population (FY2011) / Treatment Group (FY2014)	FY 2011	FY 2014 Outcome	FY 2011 (2013)*	FY 2014 Outcome**	FY 2011	FY 2014 Outcome	FY 2011	FY 2014 Outcome	FY 2011	FY 2014 Outcome
Gender										
Female	2,451	26	\$463	\$287	\$739	\$993	\$139	\$264	\$533	\$486
Male	344	1	\$1,278 (4 Households)	\$0	\$638	\$710	\$158	\$125	\$386	\$603
Race										
Black	1,898	18	\$669	\$232	\$754	\$1,029	\$146	\$261	\$531	\$484
White	874	9	\$381	\$364	\$672	\$888	\$133	\$254	\$611	\$504
American Indian / Native Alaskan	4	---	---	---	\$369	---	\$2	---	---	---
Asian / Pacific Islander	4	---	---	---	\$681	---	\$116	---	\$567	---
Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	2	---	---	---	\$1,011	---	\$206	---	\$544	---
Other	13	---	---	---	\$558	---	\$85	---	\$488	---
Ethnicity										
Non-Hispanic	2,769	27	\$527	\$276	\$724	\$982	\$141	\$259	\$515	\$491
Hispanic	26	---	\$0 (1 Household)	---	\$993	---	\$186	---	\$521	---
Excluded Households										
Elderly / Disabled & Special Partner Households	1,193	18	\$221	\$42	\$948	\$830	\$213	\$231	\$948	\$434
<p>* Historical data at time of initial occupancy was not available via LHA's computerized reporting system in FY 2011. Baseline data reflects new admissions between 2/1/2012 and 1/31/2013.</p> <p>* Historical data at time of initial occupancy was not available via LHA's computerized reporting system in FY 2014. Since 26 of 27 treatment group families were unit transfers (as opposed to new admissions), January 2013 data was used to match time period used to establish FY 2014 Annual Plan benchmarks.</p>										

V. Sources and Uses of Funds

V.3.Report.Sources and Uses of MTW Funds			
A. MTW Report: Sources and Uses of MTW Funds			
Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year			
<p>PHAs shall submit their unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the Financial Assessment System - PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system</p>			
Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility			
<p>PHAs shall provide a thorough narrative of each activity that used only the Single Fund Flexibility in the body of the Report. In the narrative, PHAs are encouraged to provide metrics to track the outcomes of these programs or activities. Activities that use other MTW waivers in addition to Single Fund Flexibility do not need to be described in this section because descriptions of these activities are found in either Section (III) Proposed MTW Activities or Section (IV) Approved MTW Activities.</p>			

V.4.Report.Local Asset Management Plan			
B. MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan			
Has the PHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year?	<input type="text"/>	No	
Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?	<input type="text"/>	or No	
If the PHA is implementing a LAMP, it shall be described in an appendix every year beginning with the year it is proposed and approved. It shall explain the deviations from existing HUD requirements and should be updated if any changes are made to the LAMP.			
Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?	<input type="text"/>	or No	
<p>In the body of the Report, PHAs should provide a narrative updating the progress of implementing and operating the Local Asset Management Plan during the fiscal year.</p>			

V.5.Report.Unspent MTW Funds			
C. MTW Report: Commitment of Unspent Funds			
In the table below, provide planned commitments or obligations of unspent MTW funds at the end of the PHA's fiscal year.			
Account	Planned Expenditure	Obligated Funds	Committed Funds
Type	N/A	0	0
N/A	N/A	0	0
N/A	N/A	0	0
N/A	N/A	0	0
N/A	N/A	0	0
N/A	N/A	0	0
N/A	N/A	0	0
N/A	N/A	0	0
Total Obligated or Committed Funds:		0	0
<p>In the body of the Report, PHAs shall provide, in as much detail as possible, an explanation of plans for future uses of unspent funds, including what funds have been obligated or committed to specific projects.</p>			
<p><i>Note : Written notice of a definition of MTW reserves will be forthcoming. Until HUD issues a methodology for defining reserves, including a definition of obligations and commitments, MTW agencies are not required to complete this section.</i></p>			

VI. Administrative

A. General description of any HUD reviews, audits or physical inspection issues that require the agency to take action to address the issue;

The LHA is compliant in all aspects; any issues noted were addressed immediately from all monitoring entities.

B. Results of latest PHA-directed evaluation

**MTW Evaluation for
The Lexington Housing Authority
Submitted by: Dr. Vernell Bennett
Kentucky State University
November 20, 2014**

Activity 1

Minimum Rent Increase to \$150 across All Housing Programs

Evaluator's Comments:

I think a better financial transition could have been made. To transition to a 200% rent increase and a mandate of having to work or be in school, compounded with the additional financial responsibility of paying utilities is a big adjustment, even with notice. Perhaps a staggering process would have been better served in this case where the increase was gradual or did not occur at the same time that tenants assumed their utilities costs.

The incentive for this project is encouraging tenants to seek employment. During the first fiscal year, the transition was not successful because a minimal percentage (23%) had employment income. However, the LHA's goal was realized and exceeded as anticipated by FY 2013 when 49% of households reported earned income.

The hardship option was excellent but holding tenants accountable for their responsibilities is paramount. The denial of the hardship request was warranted due to obvious lack of effort to seek employment on the tenant's behalf. LHA's housing programs should serve as an assist toward independence, not a barrier of it. It is critical that tenants take accountability for their circumstances and success.

Evaluation of the disparate impact analysis:

Tenants were not negatively impacted by this activity. As a matter of fact, the mandatory rent minimum appears to have improved their quality of life in regards to increased income. Even considering the rent increase, tenants' residual income increased. The income change increased in all categories with 5 averaging an increase of well above 100%. The younger households had the largest income percentage increase. Likely because they were not working and were now forced to earn a minimum income in order to maintain their housing. This activity is effective and accomplishes its goal.

Activity 2**Rent Reform Controlled Study: No Rent Reduction Request for 6 Months after Initial Occupancy of Bluegrass HOPEVI Public Housing Residents****DISCONTINUED****Evaluator's Comments:**

I believe this activity was a strong advocate for holding tenants responsible for honoring their original contracts. I think it should have been continued providing, the groups being compared would yield legitimate findings because the properties and rent amounts were comparable. I wonder if that impacted the study results which reflected a decrease in self-sufficiency. The alternative reform activity to define “work” and calculate rent assuming everyone is meeting their contractual agreement is a far more responsible and adequate reform.

Activity 3**Triennial Recertification of Connie Griffith Towers Households****Evaluator's Comments:**

This activity relieves an undue burden on “fixed income” tenants and saved staff costs by 72%! This is an excellent activity that benefits both the tenant and LHA. I agree with the suggestion of the intervention of making tenants cognizant in advance of the triennial re-certification. The slightest increase on a fixed income budget could be financially detrimental if not pre-budgeted. I recommend employing a focus group for the next reporting period to ascertain if tenants would prefer a shorter period between recertification to ease the impact of the increase to their fixed budgets.

Evaluation of the disparate impact analysis:

The data shows that minimal changes in income warrants a triennial recertification. The Native Hawaiian category consistently earned more income. Their average gross rent increased 25% but it should be noted that their average gross income per month increased 60% as well.

Activity 4**Housing Choice Voucher Rent Reform Controlled Study-No Rent Reduction Requests for 6 Months after Initial Occupancy DISCONTINUED****Evaluator's Comments:**

The HUD Rent Reform Study will adequately address this goal.

Evaluation of the disparate impact analysis:

The data reflects that this activity does not appear to be yielding the results that would support the goal of the project. It appears that the number of homes who have not complied has increased.

Activity 10**HCV Tenant-Based Special Partner Program****Evaluator's Comments**

Requiring the surrendering of the voucher upon leaving program is a very necessary caveat. The focus at this stage of treatment is to eliminate any barriers a tenant would have while undergoing treatment. Having a home should be the last of their concerns. This condition is an excellent incentive for the resident to remain in treatment. However, not meeting the agreed upon treatment plan should warrant the consequence of surrendering shelter.

Activity 12**Local, Non-Traditional Use of MTW Funds for Special Partners****Evaluator's Comments:**

Excellent incentive for tenants to achieve self-sufficiency and empowerment. These collaborative efforts encourage a greater sense of community between the LHA and several social service agencies. Housing that focuses on tenants dealing with issues that include health and aging, education, substance abuse, and rehabilitation yields multiple benefits. It can ultimately become beneficial to the individual, his or her family, and the communities in which they reside. The advantages of this specialized housing are long-term. Its affects will be felt long after the tenants no longer qualify for this specialized residency.

Activity 13**Local Self-Sufficiency Admissions and Occupancy Requirements**

Constantly updated parameters need to continue to be in place that consider increases in the cost of living and other circumstances that tenants may encounter. The focus of all housing programs needs to be assistance that provides tenants with a bridge to self-sufficiency, not assistance that becomes a barrier against independence and an enabler of dependency. Future housing programs should be created being cognizant of the community in which it will be constructed so that it will be of optimal service to those it serves. For example, rehabilitative housing should be located in a remote, not urban area.

Perhaps a more thorough follow-through will yield improved results of some housing goals. For example, is there a follow-up to confirm that students don't drop classes after being certified as full-time? Additionally, a mandate of earning a "C" or better would expedite tenants toward a speedier degree completion.

Evaluation of the disparate impact analysis:

The criteria in place for admissions and occupancy create a support system that encourages independence. The tenant responsibility expectations are realistic and fair. The data reflects an impressive success rate for LHA's activity goals. Said data also served as a harbinger which prompted some activities to be discontinued.

C. Certification that the PHA has met the three statutory requirements

CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH REGULATIONS MOVING TO WORK ANNUAL REPORT

Acting on behalf of the Public Housing Agency (PHA) listed below, as its authorized PHA official, I approve the submission of the Annual Moving to Work Report for the PHA fiscal year July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

The Agency has met the three statutory requirements of: 1) ensure that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families, as defined in section 3(b)(2) of the 1937 Act; 2) assist substantially the same total number of eligible low-income families under MTW, as would have been served absent the demonstration, and 3) maintain a comparable mix of families by family size, as would have been served or assisted had the amounts not been used under the demonstration.

Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority
PHA Name

KY004
PHA Number/HA Code

I hereby certify that all the information stated herein, as well as any information provided in the Report, is true and accurate.

Austin J. Simms
Name of Authorized Official

Executive Director
Title


Signature

November 20, 2014
Date

